

The Subscription to the SOLICITORS' JOURNAL is—*Town*, 26s.; *Country*, 28s.; with the WEEKLY REPORTER, 52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MARCH 18, 1876.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE DEBATE in the House of Commons on one of the recent appointments to the office of official referee fully justified all we have said on the subject, and resulted in the postponement of the vote for providing the salary of the officer in question, in order that inquiries might be made in reference to his appointment. The Attorney-General, who appeared as the champion of the appointment, stated that it had been made by the Lord Chancellor, "and no member of the committee would deny that the noble Lord had been really and earnestly anxious to fill all the posts by the appointment of the best men," immediately afterwards remarking that, although "it was possible" the Lord Chancellor was "not personally acquainted" with all the gentlemen he had appointed, he had relied upon the judgment of those "on whom he was entitled to rely for information and advice." The answer of Sir Henry James was, of course, obvious—the Lord Chancellor had had very little to do with the matter, and but too plainly had relied on the recommendation of some one. Was this some one, he asked, the same judge who had appointed Mr. Verey to the revising barristership a year or two ago? No reply was given to this question; it may perhaps be answered in the course of the inquiries promised by the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

THE CASE of *Sugden v. Lord St. Leonards* has naturally attracted a considerable amount of attention and interest outside the legal profession, and the daily papers have, as usual, contributed a fair quantity of reflections on the nature and result of the trial. An article in a very eminent contemporary would lead to two very singular conclusions—first, that this was the only case in which the contents of a missing will have been established and admitted to probate; and, secondly, that the result of the decision will be to make everybody utterly careless as to whether his will is in safe custody or not. On the first point we need only say that probate of the contents of lost or missing wills has been granted on parol evidence of their contents from, at any rate, the days of Swinburne down to the present time: see Swinburne, pt. 6, a 14, pl. 4, and, as a modern instance, the case of *Gardner deceased* (1 Sw. & Tr. 190), where probate was granted of a will left in Delhi at the breaking out of the Indian Mutiny, the contents of the will, which were established solely by the testator's widow and one of the attesting witnesses, being to give everything to one of the deponents. On the second point it seems to us that the effect of the late trial, which entailed a vast amount of trouble and expense, dragged all the private affairs of the testator into world-wide publicity, and admittedly ended in carrying out only part of his intention, will rather be to show the public that they cannot be too careful in putting their wills into safe custody, and in ascertaining from time to time that they continue where they have been put.

The two points of real and permanent interest to lawyers involved in the recent decision are, first, the admission, as evidence of the contents of a missing will, of declarations made by the testator after the proved execution of the will, and while it was still in his custody. This question does not seem to have been argued in the court below; at any rate it forms no portion of Sir James Hannen's very elaborate and able judgment; but much attention was bestowed on it in the Court of Appeal, the judges being evidently anxious to avoid setting so awkward a precedent as would have been set if, with regard to the chief benefit conferred on the principal witness, as to which the testator's memoranda did not corroborate her account, they had relied on her testimony alone, and that merely because her account of the rest of the will had been found to tally with independent evidence. In order to reach their decision on this point, the learned judges were obliged to reverse the case of *Quick v. Quick* (12 W. R. 1119, 3 Sw. & Tr. 442), and it may now be taken as clear law that the declarations of a testator made before or contemporaneously with the execution of his will, or at any time subsequent thereto, are proper subjects of evidence as to the contents of the will should the will itself not be forthcoming after his death. That declarations made by a testator before the execution of his will were available as evidence for the purpose of ascertaining whether the will was rightly executed or not was pretty clearly established before the recent case, but the rule now enunciated goes far beyond anything hitherto laid down.

The other point of permanent interest in the recent decision is the fact that probate was granted although the whole of the testator's intention was not known. The logical result of this would seem to be that, on satisfactory proof of only a single legacy, or devise, the court ought to admit probate of such gift; and we see no reason why the court should hesitate to follow out the principle to its fullest extent.

LORD HATHERLEY, when he moved the second reading in the Lords of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, explained that the object of that measure was to leave creditors to the management of their own affairs, subject only to due provision for the protection of the smaller creditors, and also for full disclosure by the bankrupt or debtor of his assets and affairs. No practitioner need be told how far the Act has been successful in accomplishing these last objects; and how far in the opinion of the mercantile community they have been accomplished may be learned from the petition to the House of Lords praying for an amendment of the bankruptcy law now in course of signature by bankers and merchants throughout England. There is no intimation that the petitioners are dissatisfied with the principle of leaving creditors to manage their own concerns; the suggestions are chiefly directed to the safeguards indicated by Lord Hatherley, and especially to the singular distinction drawn, in respect of them, between bankruptcy and liquidation. Here, we apprehend, the petitioners have struck at the real root of the evils attending the present system of bankruptcy law. It is astonishing that the framers of the Act of 1869, while making careful provision against many abuses in respect to bankrupts, should have left the liquidation system so full of loopholes for malpractice. The petitioners suggest the abolition to a considerable extent of the difference between the two systems. As to the recommendation that the trustee in liquidation should be subject to the same control, as to the obligation to render accounts as the trustee in bankruptcy, there can, we think, be no two opinions. But as regards some of the other recommendations it seems to us that the petitioners, while indicating the evils to be remedied, have not clearly or fully worked out the remedies. It is suggested, for instance, as regards liquidations, that the trustee should be appointed "by at least one-third of the creditors." This utterly fails to meet the grave evil of the canvas-

ing of creditors by persons neither creditors nor their solicitors. This practice ought to be prohibited. Most important of all, in our opinion, is the question of providing for full information and discussion as to the affairs of the debtor. Every one who has had any experience of liquidation meetings knows that the want of this is the great evil of the present system. The statement of the accountant is seen by none before the meeting, except, perhaps, a few friendly creditors; the other creditors cannot effectively question the debtor because no opportunity has been given for previous examination of the accounts; there is no guarantee of truthful answers from the debtor because he cannot be put upon his oath. The remedy proposed by the petitioners—the examination of the debtor before the court at the instance of any creditor—appears to us inadequate to meet these evils, but we must confess it is not easy to suggest any other which will not involve great expense. In the case of large estates it might, however, be practicable to adopt the provision suggested by an experienced correspondent in these columns some time ago, viz., that the debtor shall, upon or shortly after the filing of the petition, file a statement of his accounts, verified on oath; that a copy of this statement and the list of creditors shall be at once sent to each creditor, along with a notice of the day on which the public examination of the debtor will be held; that at such examination the debtor shall make a statement of his affairs on oath, and shall be liable to be cross-examined by any creditor; that the examination and cross-examination shall be taken down by a shorthand writer; and that at the first meeting of the creditors, to be subsequently held, there shall be submitted the notes of the examination and cross-examination for the guidance of the creditors in their deliberations. The suggestion of the petitioners that until a public prosecutor is appointed all prosecutions of bankrupts ordered by the court should be conducted by the Treasury has our hearty concurrence. The effect of the present system has been well stated as being that the less property a fraudulent bankrupt leaves for his creditors the less likelihood there is of his being punished for his frauds.

IN THE COURSE of the last long vacation we called attention to a decision of Vice-Chancellor Bacon, in a case of *Edwards v. Edwards*, that where an order had been made directing that a person named in the order, "upon his first giving security," be appointed receiver, the appointment dated back to the order so made, and did not date only from the completion of the security, and we ventured to point out the difficulties to which the decision might give rise. Vice-Chancellor Malins subsequently adopted the view of the vacation judge (see 24 W. R. 201). The matter came before the Court of Appeal on Saturday last, when the decision was reversed. The court held that the receiver's appointment took effect only from the date of the chief clerk's certificate that the security was perfected.

In two cases tried before the Lord Chief Justice on Tuesday, his lordship remarked on the careless manner in which the pleadings had been printed, stops and capital letters being entirely disregarded. His lordship said that if properly printed copies of the pleadings were not supplied he should adjourn the hearing of a cause until the mistakes were corrected.

On Monday Mr. Watkin Williams gave notice that on going into committee of supply on Civil Service estimates (law and justice), he would call attention to the practical working of the Judicature Acts with reference to—first, the unnecessary and increasing expense and delay occasioned by the new system of pleadings; secondly, the uncertainty and confusion created by the want of proper arrangements of the lists of actions for trial; thirdly, the mode of conducting business at Judges' Chambers; and ask questions.

THE NEW PRACTICE.

LEAVE TO DEFEND ON SPECIALLY-INDORSED WRIT.—Some apprehension has been expressed that, by the decision of the Queen's Bench Division in *Runnacles v. Mesquita* (noted ante, p. 373), the beneficial operation of the provisions of the new system relating to signing judgment on a specially-indorsed writ has been limited. This, we think, proceeds on a misapprehension of the provisions in question, which are intended as an extension of the principle of the Bills of Exchange Act to all liquidated demands. The rule under that Act as to leave to defend is that if the defendant by his affidavit discloses a *bona fide* defence, he must be allowed leave to defend. It is the genuineness, not the truth, of the defence which is to be determined on the affidavit, and the condition of bringing money into court will only be enforced where there is reason to doubt the genuineness of the defence (*Agra and Masterman's Bank v. Leighton*, L. R. 2 Ex. 56). Of course a mere general affidavit that the defendant has a good defence will not be sufficient to induce the court to grant him leave to defend (see ante, p. 141); but where the defendant, as in the recent case, states the nature of his defence, and that defence appears *prima facie* to be a good one, the court ought clearly to give unconditional leave to defend.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

APPEAL—SECURITY FOR COSTS—ORD. 58, R. 15.—On Saturday, March 11, an application was made to the Court of Appeal, in a case of *Wilson v. Smith*, that an appellant might be ordered to give security for the costs to be occasioned by the appeal. This is, we believe, the first application which has as yet been made under the above rule with regard to an appeal coming from the Chancery Division. The suit was instituted to restrain an alleged nuisance, and the evidence was very voluminous. At the hearing the bill was dismissed with costs. The plaintiff gave notice of appeal, and the defendant then moved for an order that the appellant should give adequate security for costs. The "special circumstances" alleged were that the plaintiff's only property was a leasehold house and the furniture in it; that the lease was of trifling value; that the plaintiff had given a bill of sale of the furniture; and that his debts exceeded the value of his property, so that he would be unable, if unsuccessful in his appeal, to pay the respondent's costs. In answer to this, the plaintiff filed an affidavit, in which he admitted the execution of the bill of sale, but denied that he was unable to pay his debts. In opposition to the application, it was urged that the rule was not intended to apply to suits which (as this was) were pending when the Judicature Acts came into operation. It was not intended to take away the right which existed under the old practice of appealing on making a deposit of £20. At first the court seemed to entertain a doubt whether the mere fact that the appellant was a poor man was a "special circumstance" within the meaning of the rule, but ultimately they ordered that he should deposit £50 in court, and that the proceedings on the appeal should be stayed until the deposit had been made. The costs of the application were to be treated as part of the costs of the appeal. Lord Justice Mellish answered the argument that the suit was pending by saying, as has been said in previous cases, that it was not pending in the Court of Appeal until the notice of appeal had been given. He thought that the object of the new rule was to do away with the old system in the Court of Chancery of making an illusory deposit on an appeal, and to enable the court in proper cases to require a substantial security to be given, to which, indeed, a respondent to an appeal in the Exchequer Chamber was formerly entitled as a matter of right. There might be good reasons why security for costs should be required upon an appeal when it was not required in the court of first instance, and his lordship thought that there was more reason for requiring an unsuccessful plaintiff, than there would for requiring an unsuccessful defendant, to give security for the costs of an appeal.

APPEAL FROM DISCRETION—AMENDMENT OF PLEADINGS—
ORDER OF JUDGE IN CHAMBERS—ORD. 27, r. 1; ORD. 58,
r. 2.—On Wednesday, March 15, in a case of *Golding v. The*
Wharton Railway and River Salt Works Company, the Court
of Appeal laid down an important general rule with regard
to appeals from interlocutory orders made by judges in
chambers on such matters as applications under ord. 27,
r. 1, for the amendment of pleadings by striking out pre-
judicial or embarrassing statements. In *Golding v. The*
Wharton Company the plaintiff applied for an order to
strike out some paragraphs of the defence as embarrassing.
The application was refused by the master, and again by Mr.
Justice Lindley in chambers, and on appeal to the Queen's
Bench Division this decision was affirmed. The plaintiff then
came to the Court of Appeal, and his appeal was dismissed
with costs. This being the first appeal which had been
brought before the court upon a matter of this description,
Lord Justice Mellish took the opportunity of stating the
principle on which the court intends to deal with such ap-
plications. He said that the judge in chambers had to ex-
ercise a discretion in the making of orders of this nature,
and except in very special cases the exercise of his discre-
tion ought not to be interfered with. The old Court of
Appeal in Chancery was not in the habit of interfering with
the discretion of the judges of first instance in matters of
practice, except where it was clear that injustice would
result from the order under appeal, and, now that appeals
could be brought from all interlocutory orders made in the
common law divisions, the same rule ought to be followed.
If in every action, as a matter of course, applications of
this kind could be carried through all these four stages—
viz., application to the master, appeal to the judge in
chambers, appeal to the divisional court, appeal to the
Court of Appeal—actions would never come to trial at all.
The Court of Appeal thought it desirable, therefore, to
discourage appeals in cases of this nature.

58, r. 2, expressly says that any judgment or order of the
High Court may be appealed from. And, as was observed
by the appellant's counsel, section 2 of the Act of 1875,
which suspends until the 1st of November, 1876, the opera-
tion of those sections of the Act of 1873 which abolished
the right of appeal to the House of Lords, only provides
that, until they come into operation, an appeal may be
brought to the House of Lords from any judgment or order
of the Court of Appeal, so that, if the enrolment had the
effect suggested, it would also have taken away the right
of appealing altogether.

COUNTER-CLAIMS.—This subject underwent a good deal of
informal discussion on Thursday, March 16, in the Rolls'
Court. The facts of the case before the court were that
S., in October last, commenced an action in the Queen's
Bench for the slander of his title as patentee against
P., who put in a defence and a counter-claim by which
he alleged that a patent of his was being infringed by
S., and claimed an injunction. P. afterwards, without
leave obtained, abandoned his counter-claim, and brought
an original action in the Chancery Division against S., in
which the same relief was claimed as in his counter-claim.
On a motion for an injunction in the case in which P. was
plaintiff, it was contended on behalf of S. (1) that P. had
no power to abandon his counter-claim without the leave
of the court, a point which the Master of the Rolls re-
fused to decide as being a point in the Queen's Bench
action, but as to which he pointed out that ord. 23, r. 1,
omits to include a counter-claim in the prohibition with
which it concludes, and that the leave would probably be
obtained if applied for in this case; (2) that P. had elected
his remedy by counter-claim, and could not, at least until
the counter-claim was validly removed from the record
in the Queen's Bench action, commence a fresh action.
This objection the Master of the Rolls overruled. In the
course of the same case the point was discussed whether a
defendant who had put in a counter-claim could obtain an
interlocutory injunction, and the Master of the Rolls finally
came to the conclusion that the court had a discretionary
power to grant an injunction in such a case under sub-
section 8 of section 25 of the Judicature Act, 1873, and
ord. 52, r. 4. Ord. 19, r. 3, it will be noticed, only applies
to final judgment.

DEFENDANT OUT OF JURISDICTION—ISSUE OF WRIT FROM
DISTRICT REGISTRY—LEAVE TO GIVE NOTICE OUT OF JURIS-
DICATION.—On Wednesday, March 8, *Inglis Richmond* moved
ex parte, before Vice-Chancellor Hall, for leave to issue out
of a district registry a writ of summons for service out of
the jurisdiction and to serve the writ or notice of it on the
defendant in Havannah. The cause of action arose in
Liverpool, and the defendant was not a British subject.
The district registrar was doubtful whether he had power
to issue the writ without the leave of the court, or to give
leave to serve it. The Vice-Chancellor said that the
district registrar clearly could not issue such a writ with-
out the leave of a judge; but after such leave was obtained
he thought the registrar might allow the writ or notice
thereof to be served out of the jurisdiction. But, without
expressly deciding the point, and inasmuch as both ap-
plications could conveniently be made to a judge together
without extra expense, he would, in this case, make an
order providing both for leave to issue the writ and to
give notice to the defendant out of the jurisdiction.

MOTIONS FOR NEW TRIAL IN DIVORCE CASES.—In the
Probate, &c., Division on Tuesday, March 14, in the case
of *Richardson v. Richardson and Frost*, in which the jury
had returned a verdict for the petitioner with £1,000
damages, *G. Browne*, on behalf of the co-respondent, moved
for a rule for a new trial. The president of the division
stated that it was the opinion both of himself and of Sir
Robert Phillimore that such motions should be made to a
divisional court, and application would be made to the Lord
Chancellor for directions on the subject. At the same time
he saw no reason why the motion should not be made to the
judge who had tried the case, if the party seeking for a new
trial consented to that course. *Browne* pointed out that it
had been necessary to make the application within fourteen
days from the trial, but elected to have the case heard before
a divisional court.

APPEAL—ENROLMENT OF DECREE—JUDICATURE ACT, 1875
s. 2—ORD. 58, r. 2.—On Friday, March 17, in a case of
Hastie v. Hastie (an appeal from the decision of Vice-
Chancellor Malins, 24 W. R. 242), it was suggested that
the appeal could not be entertained because the decree of
the Vice-Chancellor had been enrolled. The court at once
rejected this objection as utterly untenable. Lord Justice
James said that the fact that the High Court had enrolled
its own decree could not affect the proceedings in the Court
of Appeal, which is now a distinct court. Formerly an
enrolment prevented an appeal, simply because the appeal
was then a re-hearing in the same court, the Court of
Chancery. And Lord Justice Mellish pointed out that ord.

THE CIVIL BILL COURTS (IRELAND) BILL.

THE Bill for the reform of the Irish civil bill courts—those of quarter sessions on their civil side—has at last made its appearance. In two articles published last year* we showed that these tribunals ought to be remodelled, and we indicated what additional powers they should receive in the public interest, and how their administration might be improved. The Government Bill is a good measure marred by conspicuous defects in detail, and it is in part satisfactory and in part disappointing. If not so bold as it might have been, it generally proceeds on sound principles so far as it proposes to extend the jurisdiction of the civil bill courts, and in this respect it aims at conferring a real benefit on the Irish suitors, especially on those of the humbler classes. But its authors seem to have ignored the fact that a great enlargement of judicial work—especially when of a novel kind—requires a corresponding administrative change; and here it makes such fatal omissions that we are apprehensive it will prove a failure. In addition, it puts forward a scheme for the consolidation of the Irish counties, and the reduction of the Irish chairmen in number, which defers that important reform for years, and in this particular it deserves censure on constitutional and public grounds. The lines of the Bill, in a word, are excellent, but it is so imperfect and faulty in parts that its working can hardly be successful; its machinery is so bad that it will probably break down.

The Bill is divided into six parts, but it falls under two great heads—the extension of the jurisdiction of the civil bill courts, and the administrative arrangements provided by it. As regards the first, it, in a great measure, supplies a deficiency long recognized; and it enlarges the powers of the Irish chairmen on the whole in a satisfactory way. Following, in the main, our county court Acts, it gives the civil bill court, for the first time, the cognizance of equitable rights and remedies; and (clause 7) it gives the chairman, within certain limits, jurisdiction in suits for the administration of assets; for the execution of trusts generally; for the foreclosure, sale, and redemption of charges; for the specific performance of various agreements; in proceedings under the Married Women's Property Acts; in partnership and partition matters; under the Trustee Acts, and as regards infants; as to injunctions and stayings proceedings at law; and finally when landlords seek to restrain tenants from waste. All this, as we have said, has been largely borrowed from us, but it deserves notice that the jurisdiction given to the civil bill court is a good deal wider than that of the county court in point of amount, the limits generally fixed by the Irish Bill being, as to personalty, up to £500, and, as to realty, a standard of value varying from £600 to £1,000, whereas the limit with us is £500 as regards personalty and realty alike. The jurisdiction, too, in waste on the part of a landlord is a novelty in the present Bill to which there is nothing similar in county court law, but we should be the last to object to the change, for we advocated it in the before-named articles. The extension, however, of the powers of the chairmen is not confined to equity alone; it proceeds into another sphere where, in our opinion, it has long been needed. Adopting once more our example here, the Bill transfers to the civil bill court the whole jurisdiction of the Court of Probate, and (clauses 21, 24) the chairman is empowered, again within limits, to adjudicate on contested and other wills, and to grant or revoke probates and letters of administration. Here, however, the limit, as regards amount, is very much larger than with us; the county court judge is restricted to cases where the personalty is under £200 and the realty is £300 or less, but the Irish Bill gives the chairman a range of the same extent as that he will have in equity—that is, personalty up to £500, and realty up to

a much greater sum. So much as to the new jurisdiction conferred on the civil bill courts; but their existing powers are to be largely increased. In all ordinary cases which come before him, the Bill (clause 32) gives the chairman cognizance of demands up to £50, instead of £40 as now; it considerably enlarges (clause 34) his powers in ejectment, and as to cases sent from the superior courts (clause 33); and finally (clause 36), as in the case of our county courts, it enables litigants to select the civil bill court as an unrestricted forum, and by consent to try any action, criminal, being the sole exception, before the chairman, how great soever may be the claim.

This extension of the jurisdiction of the civil bill courts is certainly, we think, required in Ireland, and falls in with Irish opinion on the whole. The Irish Bar, indeed in a set of resolutions have pointed out blots in this part of the Bill; and we agree with them that, as to charges on land, the limits of the chairman's powers are unduly vague. For ourselves, too, we should have wished to see the jurisdiction of the civil bill court widened, in ordinary actions by landlords against tenants, from £100, where it now stands, to £200 at least. Under the Land Act of 1870 the Irish tenant can make claims before this tribunal against his landlord to any amount; and surely the landlord is, to some extent, entitled to an advantage of a like nature. We repeat, however, we admire the Bill so far as it is an enlarging measure, but we wish we could say, "*O si sic omnia*." When we come to its administrative details, we find nearly everywhere matter of complaint, and we much fear that, through these shortcomings, a Bill good in its essence will turn out badly. The main point of weakness in the civil bill courts is, as is well known, the subordinate staff, and we shall now repeat what was written by us more than twelve months ago upon this subject:—"The principal, indeed the only, official to be here noticed is the clerk of the peace, and it is not too much to say that his duties are large, and that his office is frequently very ill filled. The business of this officer is to act, in all respects, as the registrar of the court; he has to consider and frame indictments, to keep the records, and to make up orders, and much of the money of the suitors passes through his hands. Yet he is not appointed by the Crown or the chairman; he is usually very badly paid; and his office is sometimes improperly jobbed. Some of the clerks of the peace do their work admirably, but not a few are absentee gentlemen whose important duties are performed by deputies, in most cases at a wretched salary." Now every one at all acquainted with Ireland knows that this is a perfectly true description, and the office, in fact, of the clerk of the peace ought to have been reformed many years ago even under the existing circumstances of the civil bill courts. But who could imagine, when these tribunals were to have their borders immensely enlarged—when, in equity and testamentary matters, and also in their common law sphere, they were to possess a jurisdiction very much greater than that of our county courts—who could suppose, we say, that they would be left to depend on officials of this kind, nay, they would not be furnished with a staff analogous to that which our county court judges have? Nevertheless, this is the surprising fact. Save (clause 67) a provision as to future clerks of the peace, and another (clause 68) as to deputy-clerks of the peace, which will not really mend matters, the Bill simply does nothing at all with reference to this most important subject, and it imposes on existing clerks of the peace, and on their miserably under-paid deputies, the grave, onerous, and responsible trust of working out, in its minor details, the largely-extended jurisdiction it creates. This, we warn the Government, will never do. No doubt several of the clerks of the peace will perform the new duties as they performed the old, that is, with exemplary care and integrity, but several will as certainly fail; and, we ask, are the deputy-clerks of the peace—these, we believe, are twenty-one in number, the counties of Ireland being thirty-two—that is, are

men, as a general rule, without the least professional training, and paid from £70 to £100 a year only, to have committed to them the weighty charge of drawing up orders, of taking accounts, and of keeping records in equity suits, nay, probably, of handling the funds of the suitors? There can be no second opinion in this respect, and the machinery of the Bill must here break down. It has been said, indeed, that the authors of the Bill have been at last so convinced of this that they contemplate a change in this matter; but their project, from all that has come to our ears, will not meet the requirements of the case.

The administrative arrangements of the Bill are also most objectionable in another particular. The Irish chairmen, as is well known, are composed of a first, a second, and a third class of judges, with salaries largely differing in amount; and this is in itself an evil, as it causes efforts to obtain promotion, and leads to dependence and hopes from Government. The number of chairmen is, besides, too great; there are thirty-three for thirty-two counties, and, compared with our county court judges, this proportion must be considered excessive. As has been often pointed out—and we have done so ourselves—the true way to reform these anomalies, and to secure efficiency in this province, is to make the position of all the chairmen equal in respect of salary and judicial work, and to reduce their number by about one-third by so consolidating the Irish counties as to produce about twenty equal judicial areas. To accomplish this, all that is required is to pension off about twelve or thirteen chairmen at their present, or nearly present, salaries—the offer would be gladly accepted—and then to apportion the whole of Ireland fairly among those who should remain, and obviously the change should be carried out at once, and the new system be in full operation at the same time through all parts of the country. The Bill rejects every one of these sound principles, and is singularly faulty in this whole matter. It leaves, for the present at least (clause 74), the existing distinctions between the chairmen altogether unchanged, and thus it retains the bad system of promoting these judges, in an ascending scale, with the various mischiefs that are the consequence. This, however, is but a small thing compared with other and flagrant errors. The Bill aims at reducing the number of chairmen and uniting the counties, but it does this in the worst possible way; it arrays the chairmen into what we may call a joint-tenancy of judicial officers, continually diminishing as lives drop, and it provides (clause 71) that, when vacancies in the body occur, the survivors shall, if possible, have the empty posts annexed to their own, and that the Irish counties shall be so blended until the chairmen shall be worked down from thirty-three to twenty-one only. The effect of this will be to defer a change, which should be made at once, for twelve, or probably fifteen, years, and to leave everything for that time unsettled. But even this is by no means the most reprehensible feature in this part of the Bill. The gradual consolidation of counties (clause 71) is abandoned to the Irish Executive; they may, in fact, make what districts they choose; and as, when vacancies happen to take place, existing chairmen cannot be compelled (14 & 15 Vict. c. 57, s. 6) to succeed to these posts and to take united counties, it is actually proposed, in order to meet this difficulty (clause 71), to create temporary chairmen to take the office and to occupy it "for a limited period." These provisions strike with mischievous effect at the independence of the Irish chairmen, guaranteed to the Irish public by statute, and are unconstitutional in the very highest degree. Will a chairman of the third or the second class be in a fitting judicial position when he knows that the Government have it in their power to offer or withhold from him an adjoining county in the event of an approaching vacancy, and to raise his salary or to keep it as it is, as it may suit their purpose to consolidate or not? Can a temporary chairman, whose natural object will, of course, be to become permanent—legislation is

for men and not for angels—be held to have any independence at all? Will he not be tempted in the strongest way to subservience, and pleasing the powers that be? The provisions, in a word, which permit this system of consolidating counties as the Executive like, and which constitute judges for an occasion only, are blots in the Bill of the very darkest kind, and such an attempt to sap the liberties of a judicial body, were bold to assert, would not be hazarded in this country.

Our space precludes us from commenting upon the less important parts of the Bill. We may say, however, that we entirely approve of its provisions as regards the proof of process; but the mode of appeal it gives is, perhaps, too summary, while it certainly moves in the right direction in the relief it affords from technical errors. To conclude, the Bill, in its main outlines, contains much we can truly praise; but it is injured by grave and pernicious blemishes, and in its present shape, we undertake to say, it will neither satisfy the legal profession in Ireland nor be a good measure for the Irish public.

REPUTED OWNERSHIP.

I.

"THE doctrine of reputed ownership as formerly understood," said Pollock, C.B., in *Prismall v. Lovegrove* (6 L. T. N. S. 329), "is now out of fashion, and has been for these forty years." "It would," said Lord Selborne, in *Ex parte Watkins* (21 W. R. 530, L. R. 8 Ch. 520), "be more in accordance with my opinion to say that the doctrine of reputed ownership has been the same from first to last, but that the courts have of late years looked more narrowly and closely to the real value and weight of the circumstances which tend on the one hand to confirm, and on the other hand to exclude, the reputation of ownership. In so doing they seem to me, not to be going against the policy of the statute, but merely to be carrying it into effect in accordance with sound principle." There are in truth few branches of law in which the courts, while professing to be guided by the same principles, have given them more different applications than this of reputed ownership. The principle which justifies a provision that the debts of one man shall be paid by means of the goods of another is that the real owner of the goods has, by his carelessness, enabled the apparent possessor to hold himself out to the world as having property which he really has not, and thus to gain credit which he would not otherwise have obtained. In former times the courts were perhaps too much disposed to look more at the advantage of the creditor than at the hardship to the owner of the goods; but in recent times the course of decisions shows a tendency to a more just appreciation of the subject, and an application of the doctrine more consistent with the interests of all the different parties concerned.

The doctrine had its inception in the Bankruptcy Statute (21 Jac. 1, c. 19), s. 11, and it is not a little curious that its modern form is due to the blundering drafting of that section. It is clear from the preamble that the provision was intended to apply only to property which, having once belonged to the bankrupt, had been sold by him, but of which he still remained apparent or reputed owner. But the language of the enacting part of the section was made wider than was necessary to carry out the object announced in the preamble. Nevertheless, it was not established that the words were to be taken in their widest sense until 1774, when Lord Mansfield and the Court of King's Bench held that the enactment was not restrained by the preamble, but extended to goods of a third person which had been left with a trader. The statute of 6 Geo. 4 omitted the preamble, and retained only the enacting part of the section, and its provisions have been in substance repeated in the later Bankruptcy Acts. Till the passing of the Act of 1861 only traders were subject to the bankruptcy laws, but by that Act this restriction was removed. By the Act of 1869, however,

the application of the doctrine of reputed ownership is expressly limited to traders. The 15th section of the latter Act (sub-section 5) enacts that the property of a bankrupt divisible among his creditors shall include (*inter alia*) "all goods and chattels being, at the commencement of the bankruptcy, in the possession, order, or disposition of the bankrupt, being a trader, by the consent and permission of the true owner, of which goods and chattels the bankrupt is reputed owner, or of which he has taken upon himself the sale or disposition as owner: provided that things in action, other than debts due to him in the course of his trade or business, shall not be deemed goods and chattels within the meaning of this clause." The first question which arises upon this enactment is, What property is included in the terms "goods and chattels"?

The struggle of the courts formerly was, as Mr. Baron Pigott observed in *Priestly v. Pratt* (15 W. R. 639, L. R. 2 Ex. 101), "rather to give as much as possible to the assignee, than to discover the true owner," and in this spirit it was held that, though the reputed ownership clause was originally in its express terms confined to goods and chattels, yet it extended to *choses in action*, with respect to which, as the bankrupt could have no visible possession of them, it is difficult to see how they could in any way form the basis of the credit given to him by the persons with whom he dealt. That *choses in action* are within the clause is now, however, distinctly recognized by the statute; but the section of the Act above quoted excepts *choses in action* other than debts due to the bankrupt in the course of his trade. The question has arisen, upon the construction of section 15, whether the words "debts due" include only debts actually due, and payable at the commencement of the bankruptcy, or whether they extend to debts the amount of which is then ascertained, though they are not payable till a subsequent time, and to contingent claims, which may or may not result in a debt, the contingency not having happened at the date of the bankruptcy. In *Ex parte Kemp* (22 W. R. 462, L. R. 9 Ch. 383) it was held by the Court of Appeal that the clause is not to be confined to debts presently payable, but that, on the other hand, it will not include demands which are not, properly speaking, debts, and that, until a sum certain has become due, and is to be paid in all events, there is no debt due within the meaning of the section.

In order to bring the reputed ownership clause into operation, it is plain that these three things are requisite—(1) There must be in the possession, order, or disposition of the bankrupt goods of which another person is the true owner. (2) This state of things must exist with the consent of the true owner. (3) The bankrupt must have acquired the reputation of ownership.

(1) As to the first requisite it has been decided that the possession of the bankrupt must be a sole possession. Thus in *Ex parte Dorman* (21 W. R. 94, L. R. 8 Ch. 51) it was held that chattels, the property of a third person, in the possession of two partners, one of whom only had been adjudicated a bankrupt, did not fall within the clause. As was pointed out by Lord Justice Mellish, cases have happened in which one member of a most wealthy and solvent firm has, from his private extravagance, become bankrupt, and it would be absurd that all persons who had trusted the firm with the possession of their goods should be deprived of their property. It is not essential, however, that the goods should be in the actual possession of the bankrupt. In *Hornaby v. Miller* (7 W. R. 53, 1 E. & E. 192) a threshing machine, which had been let out on hire by the bankrupt, and at the time of his bankruptcy was in the possession of the hirer, was held to pass to his assignees. The fact that goods have been taken adversely out of a bankrupt's possession by a trespasser or wrongdoer will not exclude the reputed ownership clause. Thus, in *Barrow v. Bell* (4 W. R. 16, 5 E. & B. 540), a sheriff, under an execution against a trader, had seized, not only goods belonging to him, but other goods

which were not his, but were in his possession. It was held that the latter goods passed to the trader's assignees in bankruptcy. And in the recent case of *Ex parte Edey* (23 W. R. 519, L. R. 19 Eq. 264), goods which had been mortgaged by a duly registered bill of sale were left by the mortgagee in the possession of the mortgagor; but, prior to the filing of the petition, the goods had been seized by the sheriff under an execution issued by another creditor, and they remained in the sheriff's possession till after the filing of the petition. The Chief Judge held that the wrongful possession of the sheriff did not exclude the operation of the clause, and consequently that the goods passed to the trustee. These cases appear at first sight to conflict with *Ex parte Fox* (6 W. R. 417, 2 De G. & J. 230), but the real ground of the decision there seems to have been that the consent of the true owner of the goods to their possession by the bankrupt had been withdrawn before the bankruptcy. We may also notice here that the registration of a bill of sale will not exclude the application of the clause. There is, indeed, in *Ashton v. Blackshaw* (18 W. R. 307, L. R. 9 Eq. 510), a dictum of Malins, V.C., ascribing that effect to the registration of a bill of sale, and the dictum was supposed to have been adopted by the Chief Judge in *Ex parte Homan* (19 W. R. 1078, L. R. 12 Eq. 598). This view, however, was clearly inconsistent with such cases as *Badger v. Shaw* (2 E. & E. 472) and *Stansfeld v. Cubitt* (2 De G. & J. 222), and it has since been distinctly repudiated by the Chief Judge himself in *Ex parte Harding* (L. R. 15 Eq. 223).

Recent Decisions.

ADVERTISEMENTS BY ADMINISTRATRIX UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. c. 35, s. 29.

(*Newton v. Sherry*, C.P. Div., 24 W. R. 371).

In one of the earliest cases decided upon section 29 of Lord St. Leonards' Act, Vice-Chancellor Malins explained the meaning of that provision as being that, by the advertisements and proceedings specified therein, the executor or administrator became entitled to the same protection as he would have had if the assets had been administered under the decree of the court (*Clegg v. Rowland*, 15 W. R. 251, L. R. 3 Eq. 368, 375). That this was the object of the enactment would seem to be clear enough from the language:—"Where an executor or administrator shall have given such or the like notices as . . . would have been given by the Court of Chancery in an administration suit for creditors and others, to send in to the executor or administrator their claims, . . . such executor or administrator shall, at the expiration of the time named in the said notices, or the last of the said notices, for sending in such claims, be at liberty to distribute the assets of the testator or intestate, . . . and shall not be liable for the assets, or any portion thereof, so distributed to any person of whose claim such executor or administrator shall not have had notice at the time of distribution: . . . but nothing in the present Act contained shall prejudice the right of any creditor or claimant to follow the assets, or any part thereof, into the hands of the person or persons who may have received the same respectively." An executor or administrator who distributed assets under a decree of the court was protected from the claims alike of legatees or next of kin as of creditors (*Farrell v. Smith*, 1 Ball & B. 337). But an impression seems to have prevailed that an executor or administrator who avails himself of the provision in Lord St. Leonards' Act is protected only against the claims of creditors, and we have observed that in some advertisements under the section notice is merely given "that all persons claiming debts or liabilities against the estate" shall send in their claims. In the recent case it was contended, in an action on an administration bond brought by one of the next of kin of an intestate against a surety in the

bond, that the enactment did not protect the administratrix against the claims of next of kin. But the court pointed out that the words of the section printed above in italics clearly contemplate classes of claimants other than creditors, and, mainly on this ground, refused to narrow the construction of the section in the manner suggested. The decision is clearly correct, but it would seem that stronger ground might have been taken for it. The construction the court was asked to put upon the section would really strike out the latter part of it; for if it was adopted, the administrator, after distributing the assets, might, contrary to the express provision, still be liable for them to a "person [the section does not say to a creditor] of whose claim he had not notice at the time of distribution."

A further question was raised as to the sufficiency of the advertisements. In the first place, instead of following the usual form and calling upon "all creditors and other persons having any claims or demands against the estate of" the deceased to send in their demands, they seem merely to have called upon all "creditors and others," and it was contended that the words "and others" must mean others having claims of the same kind as creditors. The court held that the advertisement was sufficient, since it followed the words of the section. We would suggest, however, whether for the future it will not be desirable in these advertisements to add express words giving explicit warning of the effect of the section, so as to afford more clear information, and shut out the possibility of question as to the sufficiency of the notice. The notice might call upon "all creditors and other persons having any claim or demand against, or claiming any interest in, the estate," &c.

Another question raised as to the advertisements was that they ought to have been published in some American newspapers, because it was alleged that the administratrix had some ground for suspecting that one of the persons interested was in that country. The court said that where the personal representative has any knowledge or suspicion that a person interested is in a foreign country he should insert advertisements in the newspapers of that country; and under the circumstances of the case before them they thought that further inquiry was necessary as to whether there was reasonable ground for the administratrix to entertain any such suspicion, and upon the result of that inquiry would depend the question whether the publication of the advertisement in the English papers only was sufficient.

to the new practice, of the part of the work above referred to would have been found useful. The chief changes in this edition appear to be the alteration of the headings of many of the forms; the insertion of several new cases and of some judgments of Dr. Bettesworth; of the fees to be taken by solicitors and paid to the court in common form business, as directed by the Rules of 1874; and a considerable increase in the number of forms in non-contentious business. The Intestates' Widows and Children Act, 1873 (36 & 37 Vict. c. 52), is printed in full, but we do not find the amending Act of 38 & 39 Vict. c. 27—the effect of which, it will be remembered, is to extend the provisions of the first-named statute to the children of intestate widows.

General Correspondence.

THE CHAIRMEN OF THE IRISH CIVIL BILL COURTS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—In one point the chairmen of the Irish civil bill courts are seriously wronged by the Bill for the extension of the jurisdiction of their courts now before Parliament. The salaries of the English county court judges were raised not less than £300 a year when an equity jurisdiction was conferred on them; but the Irish chairmen are not to have any addition to their present salaries (clause 59) though their new duties will be much ampler than those of their English brethren. As an excuse, indeed, for this piece of injustice, "an understanding," it has been said, was "come to" when the salaries of the chairmen were lately increased for their important services under the Land Act; that this was to be a bar for all future claims in respect of the new powers then proposed to be given to them—a receipt in full, in short, for such prospective demands. So far, however, as regards the chairmen, such "an understanding" has no existence; their secretary, writing on behalf of the body, has contradicted, in the *Times*, the statement; and I would challenge the production of a scrap of paper, nay, of a memorandum of a conversation, which can fairly bind them as regards this matter. Besides, if an "understanding" was made behind their backs and without their authority, it would not apply to the present occasion; it would refer only to the jurisdiction given by a defunct Bill of the late Government, whereas that conferred by the present Bill is not far from double the first in extent; and thus, the plea, in itself a sham one, does not cover the charge it purports to meet. Then it has been alleged, by economic critics, that, considering the amount of the chairmen's work, they have been, hitherto, too well paid, and that it is just to lay a fresh burden on them without compensation of any kind. This, however, simply ignores the position of these judges, and their agreement with the State—the very conditions on which they fulfil their duties. The chairmen are barristers practising at the bar—that is, making their livelihood in their profession, or in walks more or less connected with it—and when they accepted office they expressly reserved this valuable and important privilege, and exercise it up to the present moment. If this Bill, however, should become law, this stipulated right must be greatly impaired, nay, probably, will be wholly destroyed—for it is needless to say that an equity judge ought, as a rule, to be ever at his post—and as the result, the chairmen will be driven from the bar, either in part or wholly; nay, if the English county courts are a true index, they will ultimately be compelled to reside in their counties. By what title, I would ask, can the State, having allowed a judicial body a certain status (14 & 15 Vict. c. 59, s. 2), now transform it, to their immense detriment, without giving a just equivalent? by what right, having made a fixed arrangement—a contract in the truest sense of the word—can it, without compensation, reduce or destroy the margin of time

Reviews.

PROBATE PRACTICE.

THE COMMON FORM PRACTICE OF THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE IN GRANTING PROBATE AND ADMINISTRATIONS. By HENRY CHARLES COOTE, F.S.A., late Proctor in Doctors' Commons. Seventh Edition. London: Butterworths. 1876.

Nearly five years have elapsed since the publication of the last edition of this book, which has long held a high reputation among solicitors, but we find little change in its contents. The Judicature Acts, which have rendered obsolete so many works of practice, have left this almost untouched. Mr. Coote gives in his first chapter an outline of such parts of the recent legislation as relate to probate practice; but this is of course only incidentally connected with his subject; the alterations effected by the Judicature Acts in non-contentious probate business being confined to a few verbal changes in forms and orders. The portion of the work treating of contentious probate business, edited by Dr. Tristram, which appeared in former editions, is now omitted. It is true that the work, by its title, only professes to deal with common form practice, but we are inclined to think that the retention, in a revised form adapted

which the chairmen claimed to retain for professional and other work, and which supplies many of them with a large part of their incomes? Put the case thus, and there is no answer to it, unless the State chooses openly to break faith with an order of men whose important services it obtained on the above-named terms, and who command, throughout Ireland, complete confidence. The chairmen, I hope, may safely appeal, in this matter, from official parsimony to the sense of justice that directs Parliament. They only ask to be assimilated, as regards salary and other expenses, to the English county court judges, and the claim seems to be simple justice, for if—though this would be more than doubtful should the Bill become law as it stands—the quantity of their work would, perhaps, be less than that performed by their brethren in England, it certainly would be of a higher quality. English county court judges have nothing resembling the criminal jurisdiction of the Irish chairmen—that of the quarter sessions at common law extending to all but capital crimes—nor are any inquiries held before them to be compared, in gravity or extent of claim, to those under the Irish Land Act.

Dublin, March 11.

A CHAIRMAN.

THE OFFICIAL REFEREES.

On Friday, March 10, upon the vote in Committee of Supply for £173,025 for the Chancery Division of the High Court, the following debate occurred on the recent appointments of official referees:—

Mr. Waddy, in reference to the appointment of the four official referees, complained that one of these gentlemen had had no experience in the regular practice of his profession, and could not, therefore, obtain the confidence of suitors in the discharge of his duties. He moved that the vote be reduced by £1,500, the amount of this gentleman's salary.—The Attorney-General said that, although he was not personally acquainted with the gentleman in question, he had received from those who were fully qualified to judge the highest testimony to his ability, attainments, and general fitness for his office. He could not admit that a man could not be qualified to become an official referee simply because he had not obtained a large and lucrative practice. (Mr. Waddy.—“Any practice.”) If it were the correct principle not to appoint men to high judicial offices until they had attained large practice at the bar, he could only say that many of the most eminent judges who had ever sat upon the bench would not have been appointed. Further, it must be remembered that the appointment had been made by the Lord Chancellor, and no member of the committee would deny that the noble lord had been really and earnestly anxious to fill all the posts by the appointment of the best men. It was possible that the Lord Chancellor was not personally acquainted with all the gentlemen whom he had appointed, but in cases where he had no personal knowledge of the gentlemen in question he had relied upon the judgment, knowledge, and experience of those on whom he was entitled to rely for information and advice.—Sir. H. James regretted the line of argument which had been adopted by the Attorney-General, and he appealed from his hon. and learned friend to the Government generally to prevent what would otherwise prove a grave and very important scandal. He protested against the question being made one of how the Lord Chancellor had or had not chosen a gentleman for a particular post. The Lord Chancellor had very little to do with the matter, and he therefore trusted that the vote would be postponed in order that further inquiry might be made before the appointment was ratified by Parliament. The duties of the gentleman appointed to the office in question would be both varied and responsible, and he would be subject to no public criticism. The gentleman in question had to decide cases without a jury, and before his appointment was ratified the committee should have reason to believe that he was a man of experience in the practice of his profession and one who possessed a judicial mind. Once only had he appeared in court, as far as they knew, and it was on an occasion when a learned judge dispossessed a revising barrister and appointed him in his place. He asked was it not the case

that the learned judge who appointed the gentleman in question revising barrister recommended him also to the Lord Chancellor for this appointment? Was there not good reason to apprehend that the ratification of this appointment would be a public scandal? Under all the circumstances, he hoped the vote would be postponed.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer confessed that what had been said in the debate on this subject was quite new to him. The most convenient course, he thought, under the circumstances, would be to withdraw the vote in order that inquiries might be made in reference to the appointment in question.—Mr. Watkin Williams rose to say a word on behalf of the gentleman in question, Mr. Verey. He had known him for years, and could only say that if he were unfit for the appointment in question, so also were the three other gentlemen who had been appointed; knowing him as he did, he did not hesitate to say that he regarded Mr. Verey as the most competent of the four. He hoped the Government would postpone the vote in order to consider all the appointments.

The motion was withdrawn, the vote was postponed, and progress was reported.

POLICE STATISTICS FOR 1875.

The reports of the inspectors of constabulary for the three districts of England and Wales, up to the end of last September, have been presented to Parliament. It is to be regretted that the inspectors do not all prepare the summaries for their respective districts in the same form. Thus Lieutenant-Colonel Cobbe, in the first district (the Eastern and Midland counties and North Wales), and Captain Elgee, in the second (or Northern) district, reproduce the statistics for the last five years, but Captain Willis for the third district (the South of England and South Wales), only gives the figures for 1874 and 1875; while, as regards the large population of the Northern district, the inspector offers no remarks on the subject of summary convictions, and though the numbers under this head are given in the tables at the end of his report, there is no opportunity for ascertaining whether these have increased or diminished during the year. There is also a want of uniformity in the form of the returns collected as to the working of the Prevention of Crimes Act.

As regards indictable offences we are again struck with the great discrepancy between the number of crimes reported and the number of persons apprehended, though the disproportion is not quite so serious, as it was during the year 1874. Colonel Cobbe reports that the police received information of 6,881 crimes, but made only 4,070 arrests; in the Northern district the offences were 21,362, and the arrests only 9,447; while in the third district the numbers are respectively 5,679 and 3,964. In the agricultural counties and the smaller boroughs it will be found that the reported crimes and the apprehensions bear a fair proportion to one another, but in the larger centres of population the discrepancy is rather alarming; thus at Hartlepool there were 25 reported offences, and only 10 apprehensions, while at South Shields the numbers were respectively 115 and 38, at Newcastle-upon-Tyne 740 and 91, at Liverpool 4,723 and 1,591, at Manchester 4,306 and 1,047, and at Bristol 837 and 134.

Colonel Cobbe describes a steady decrease for four years in the indictable offences reported, but a rise (in almost the same proportion) in the total number of summary convictions, but this is partly explained by the number of indictable offences which are disposed of by magistrates. Captain Elgee's district, on the other hand, exhibits a gradual increase in the number of indictable offences, which he accounts for by the directions recently issued by which all undetected larcenies, where the property is worth more than 5s., are to be reported as indictable. Captain Willis's return under this head is the most satisfactory of all, since he states that both classes of offences are decreasing, though the value of his report is somewhat impaired by the fact that the boroughs of Launceston and Maidenhead have made no reports on the subject.

Another important branch of the inspectors' reports relates to the operation of the Prevention of Crimes Act, and though the practical results of that measure are satisfactory there appear to be some difficulties in the working, which make it difficult to arrive at accurate conclusions.

Thus Colonel Cobbe points out that so many persons under police supervision are found to migrate from one district to another that it is difficult to arrive at the total number of that class; individuals must in many cases be returned twice over. Captain Elgee thinks that the 8th section of the Act is defective, and that immediately on his liberation from prison a person who is to be subject to supervision should be compelled to notify to the police his intended place of residence, and to report himself without unnecessary delay. He states that under the existing system a released prisoner often goes to a locality other than that which he has designated as his future place of abode, or, by remaining less than forty-eight hours in each place which he visits, he avoids becoming subject to punishment for failure to report himself. It is clear, too, that in many cases the traces of persons of this class become lost to the police authorities, as will be apparent from the following statistics. In the first district there resided during the year 608 licensed convicts, and 363 persons "under supervision"; of the former class 145 left the district (34 absconding), 33 were re-committed for fresh offences, and 14 for breach of the terms of their licences, while of the latter class 77 left the district (30 absconding); and at the end of the year 274 of the former, and 237 of the latter, class remained in the district. In the Northern counties 788 of the first class and 619 of the second class reported themselves during the year, and the numbers remaining at Michaelmas last were 408 and 567 respectively; 70 of the former and 134 of the latter were imprisoned for fresh offences and as to the licensed class, the licence in 37 cases was revoked altogether. In the third district the particulars are more meagre: 394 licensed convicts and 398 persons under supervision resided during the year, out of which numbers 174 and 293 respectively remained in September. The latter number includes those re-committed to prison, while of the first class 24 appear to have found their way back in consequence of fresh offences.

The reports as to the extent of the prevalence of drunkenness will have been looked for with some interest, since last year was the first in which it has been possible accurately to test the working of Mr. Cross's Act of 1874. The returns are on the whole satisfactory. Colonel Cobbe says that "the Licensing Acts are generally favourably spoken of by the police, and it is represented that there is greater quiet at an earlier hour of the night; that midnight brawls are less frequent, and that drunkenness is more rarely accompanied by riot and disorder." There has been also a decrease in the number of assaults on the police, but at the same time there is a startling increase in the number of convictions for drunkenness throughout the district, which rose from 22,752 in 1873, and 23,198 in 1874, to 25,086 in 1875. On the other hand, the convictions of keepers of licensed houses have very much diminished. Captain Elgee also reports a large increase of convictions for drunkenness, but a smaller number against the keepers of houses. He complains of the difficulty experienced in obtaining convictions on charges of supplying liquor to drunken persons, and suggests an amendment of section 69 of the Act of 1872. He thinks that licensing committees ought to have wider discretion as to the grant of licences to houses where liquor is sold for consumption off the premises. Captain Willis has found a slight decrease in the number of convictions for drunkenness throughout his district, though there is a larger number of convictions recorded against keepers of licensed houses; but he attributes the former result to the long strikes in the coal trade and in other branches of industry. Coming to the respective boroughs and counties, the statistics of drunkenness show great fluctuations. Chard, Helston, and St. Ives are in the honourable position of being free from prosecutions throughout the year, though in the last-named borough there were five convictions during the year 1874. A few of the boroughs in the South of England also exhibit gratifying results. At Hythe the convictions have fallen from 16 to 8, at Salisbury from 38 to 8, at Brighton from 306 to 271, and at Bristol from 997 to 935. Birmingham remains nearly stationary, while Hull (unlike most of its Northern neighbours) shows during three years a steady improvement, the numbers falling from 1,473 in 1873 to 1,456 in 1874, and 1,158 in 1875. The centres of industry in the North show a very black list: thus in the three years the respective numbers at Dewsbury are 309, 562, and 606; at Macclesfield 116, 145, and 215; at Warrington 506, 909, and 942; at Leeds 1,504, 1,652, and 2,123; at Manchester 7,688, 8,807, and 9,807; and at Liverpool 17,046, 19,280, and 20,534. Some of the counties also

evinced discouraging results; in Durham the convictions have risen from 1,395 to 1,737, and again to 2,053, and in Derbyshire the successive totals are 9,926, 10,809, and 11,478. In Norfolk it is stated that while there is less disorder there has not been the expected decrease in drunkenness, but this state of things is concurrent with a general increase of wages. In Staffordshire there is an increase of drunkenness, contrasted with a decrease in the preceding year, and the abolition of the necessity for indorsement of the licences of convicted publicans is thought to have a bad effect. Flintshire, too, shows an increase of drunkenness, attributed to the increase of the population on the opening out of fresh collieries.

The reports as to the prevalence of vagrancy are not given in a tabulated form, and there is no information on this subject from the Northern district. Colonel Cobbe states that, notwithstanding isolated cases of increase, the decrease in the number of vagrants which he indicated last year has, on the whole, steadily continued, while Captain Willis records a steady decrease of numbers, except in the mining districts of South Wales, where the distress arising from the strikes has turned many regular workmen into vagrants.

By combining the total returns from each district, we arrive at the following results:—The number of indictable offences reported to the police in England and Wales has decreased by 10 only, namely, from 33,932 to 33,922. The total number of summary convictions in 1875 was 432,855, but, owing to the defect in the return from the Northern district, these figures cannot be compared with the numbers for the year 1874. The convictions for drunkenness rose from 146,974 to 159,934, while the convictions of keepers of licensed houses (concurrently with an increase of the number of licences) rose from 3,144 to 3,525.

THE LAW PRINTERS AND STATIONERS AND THE JUDICATURE ACT.

A meeting of master printers and law stationers was held on Thursday afternoon at the Freemasons' Tavern, for the purpose of taking into consideration the charges allowed under the Judicature Act for the printing of short legal documents, and for the adoption of a petition on the subject to the judges of her Majesty's Supreme Court of Judicature. The chair was taken by Mr. W. S. Johnson (Nassau Steam Press), who stated that the meeting was the outcome of one which had been held a short time since at the Inns of Court Hotel, when a committee was appointed to draw up a memorial to the Lord Chancellor and the other judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature. Another petition had been drawn up by Mr. Cruikshanks, the hon. secretary to the committee, and both would be submitted to the meeting. The charges allowed for printing short legal documents (and under the Judicature Act the great majority of papers printed were of only a few folios) had evidently been made in error, as they were not only unremunerative to the printers, but in many cases the work had to be executed at a loss. The judges, however, were wise and good men, and if the trade could succeed in satisfying them that they had a grievance to complain of, it was certain to be remedied. The secretary read the two forms of petitions prepared, one of which was adopted. A discussion arose as to whether the meeting should add to the petition a scale of charges which the trade would be willing to adopt. Mr. Willoughby, law stationer, stated that before any action had been taken by the trade, his firm had submitted such a scale to the Lord Chancellor, and had received a non-official promise that the judges would take it into consideration. Ultimately it was resolved, by a majority of twenty-two against eighteen, that a scale of charges should be added to the petition, and, after considerable discussion, a scale was agreed on, and a deputation appointed to present the petition, after which the proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks to the chairman.

On Tuesday in the House of Commons, in reply to Mr. Bell, the Attorney-General said that a Bill for carrying out the recommendations of the Committee on the Bankruptcy Laws would be introduced as soon as the business of the session permitted.

Notes.

IN A CASE OF *Edwards v. Edwards*, heard by the Court of Appeal on Saturday, March 11, referred to elsewhere on another point, a novel question was raised with regard to the effect of the Bills of Sale Act, 1854. The object of the Act, as appears by the preamble, was to prevent frauds being committed on creditors by means of secret bills of sale, and the Act provides, in effect, that, unless a bill of sale is registered within twenty-one days from the date of its execution, or an actual (not merely formal) possession is taken by the grantee of the chattels comprised in it, it shall, as against the trustee in bankruptcy and the execution creditors of the grantor, be "null and void to all intents and purposes whatsoever." In *Edwards v. Edwards* it was contended that, where a bill of sale contained only an equitable assignment of chattels, and it was shown that an execution creditor had had actual notice of it before his debt was contracted, the mischief contemplated could not arise, the creditor not having been deceived. And it was argued that under such circumstances, though the bill of sale had not been registered, and the goods had been allowed to remain in the apparent possession of the grantor, the Act did not apply, and the title of the grantee ought to prevail over that of the execution creditor. In support of this argument the well-known case of *Le Neve v. Le Neve* (Amb. 436) was relied on, in which it was held that an unregistered settlement of land in a register county was to be preferred in equity to a registered settlement of later date, the parties interested under the second settlement having had actual notice of the first. The Court, however, were of opinion that endless difficulties would arise unless the words of the Act were followed strictly. If the words had been "void at law and in equity," there could have been no room for doubt, and the meaning of the words used was in effect the same. The parties were entitled to stand on their strict rights, and it would not be in accordance with modern practice to qualify the meaning of a statutory enactment by introducing a proviso not to be found in it. *Le Neve v. Le Neve* was to be distinguished by the circumstance that, by the Act there in question (7 Anne, c. 20), the unregistered deed is only made "void against any subsequent purchaser or mortgagee," that is, as Lord Hardwicke said, "it gives him the legal estate, but it does not say that such subsequent purchaser is not left open to any equity which a prior purchaser or incumbrancer may have," whereas the above-quoted words of the Bills of Sale Act go much further.

MR. SAMUEL WARREN, in his "Introduction to Law Studies," impresses upon students the importance of attaining a faculty of readily applying the principles of leading cases. This talent was strikingly illustrated last week in an undefended divorce case, in which there was a claim for damages against the co-respondent. The petitioner's counsel quoted the rule in *Armory v. Delamirie*, that when the finder or wrongful possessor of a jewel refused to give it up the law presumed that the jewel was of the highest possible value, and claimed that the same presumption should be made in assessing the value of his client's wife. Sir James Hannen, however, demolished this ingenious argument by pointing out that the petitioner had alleged in his petition that he was "informed and verily believed" that his wife (the lost "jewel") had been for nearly three years a common prostitute, and the jury, while finding that the allegations in the petition were proved, refused to award any damages.

AN AMERICAN CONTEMPORARY, in noticing a recent volume of Transatlantic law reports, complains bitterly of the prolixity of the judges. "In *Eastman v. Clark* it was adjudged that participation in profits is not a decisive test of partnership. It takes two judges and seventy-eight pages to say this. Judge Smith starts off modestly and succinctly in fourteen pages, but Judge Doe brings up the rear with sixty-three! The point in *Fay v. Parker* is that exemplary damages are not recoverable in a civil action for a tort which may also be criminally punished. Judge Foster occupies sixty-nine pages in saying this, and in querying whether they are recoverable in any civil action. It is

evident that Judge Foster was determined not to be outdone by his brethren in length or learning. He quotes from Milton's 'Paradise Lost'; also from Dante. Judge Foster is also sarcastic; he gives many other judges very severe 'wipes.' Finally comes *Aldrich v. Wright*. A statute provided that mink should not be destroyed between certain dates, under a prescribed penalty. The defendant shot mink on his own land while they were chasing his geese. Held, that under the constitution which gave him a right to 'protect property,' he had a 'natural, essential, and inherent right' to kill those mink. Judge Doe rises to the consideration of this grave topic in an opinion of thirty pages, and cites among other authorities, Sidney Smith's 'Essay on Spring Guns.'

Societies.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the ordinary weekly meeting of the society, held at the Law Institution on Tuesday, the 14th inst. (Mr. E. P. Rouse in the chair), the question discussed was "Should the proposal of the Government for the constitution of a court of final appeal be adopted?" Mr. C. Batts having opened the question in the affirmative, after a full and long debate the question was answered in the negative by a majority of fifteen votes.

BIRMINGHAM LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

The first meeting of the spring session of this society was held on Tuesday evening last, Henry Parish, Esq., in the chair. There were nearly forty members present. The special business consisted in the election of six new members and a motion brought forward by the secretary (Mr. J. W. Browett) upon the subject of a petition to Parliament in favour of Lord Selborne's School of Law Bill. It was, however, unanimously resolved to hold a special meeting to consider the provisions of the Bill before presenting such petition. An animated discussion ensued upon the following moot point:—"A tenant holds of trustees, who authorize the *cestui que trust* to give notice to quit; the *cestui que trust* does so in his own name without purporting to be agent for the trustees. Is such a notice good?" Mr. George A. Erett led in the affirmative, and Mr. James Cochrane in the negative, both being supported by several members of the society. The question was decided in the negative by a majority of one. A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the meeting.

PLYMOUTH, STONEHOUSE, AND DEVONPORT LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held at the Athenæum, Plymouth, on Friday, March 10, William Adams, Esq., in the chair. On the motion of Mr. E. F. Fox (hon. sec.), seconded by Mr. M. Harrison, it was unanimously resolved "That this society do, in conjunction with 'The United Law Students' Society, London,' present a petition to Parliament in favour of Lord Selborne's Bill for establishing a School of Law, such petition to be signed by all members of this society who may so desire." The subject for the evening's discussion was as follows:—"Has a tenant who holds over, and has become tenant at sufferance, the right to sever fixtures during the time he continues in possession as such tenant? (*Leader v. Homewood*, 5 C. B. N. S. 546)." Mr. C. Matthews advocated the affirmative, and was opposed by Messrs. W. Eastlake and C. France. In the discussion which ensued Messrs. M. Harrison, Lloyds, Guy, and Fox joined, and after a reply from Mr. Matthews, and a summing up from Mr. Adams, the question was put to the meeting, and carried in favour of the negative by the casting vote of the chairman.

A parliamentary return shows that the sums paid for services in the Albert Arbitration were, to the arbitrator, £2,000; the assessor, 5,700 guineas; and the liquidators, £12,275 18s. The gross amount paid to solicitors and parliamentary agents for costs was £19,264 10s. 11d. The expenses in the Court of Chancery were £71,668 1s. 7d.

Appointments, Etc.

Mr. HENRY THOMAS BROWN, solicitor (of the firm of W. & H. T. Brown & Rogers), of Chester, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Cheshire (John Baskerville Glegg, Esq.) to be Under-Sheriff of that County for the current year. Mr. John Tatlock, of Chester, will be the Acting Under-Sheriff.

Mr. WILLIAM DENT, solicitor (of the firm of Deakin, Dent, & Son), has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Staffordshire (Richard Holt Briscoe, Esq.) to be Under-Sheriff of that County for the present year. Messrs. Hand, Blakiston, & Everett, of Stafford, will again be the Acting Under-Sheriffs.

Mr. GEORGE HINDS, solicitor, of Goudhurst, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Sussex (William Courtenay Morland, Esq.) to be Under-Sheriff of that County for the present year. Mr. Hinds was admitted a solicitor in 1841, and is vestry clerk of Goudhurst and clerk to the Highway and Burial Boards.

Mr. GRIFFITH THOMAS PICTON-JONES, solicitor (of the firm of Picton-Jones & Roberts), of Carnarvon and Pwllheli, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Carnarvonshire (Robert Carreg, Esq.) to be Under-Sheriff of that County for the present year.

Mr. THOMAS GLAISBY MANN, solicitor (of the firm of Mann & Son), of York, has been appointed by the Sheriff of the city of York (Mr. John Ayre) to be Under-Sheriff of that City for the present year.

Mr. SHELTO THOMAS PEMBERTON, puisne judge of the Leeward Islands, has been appointed Chief Justice of the Bahama Islands, in succession to Sir George Campbell Anderson.

Mr. FREDERICK ROWLAND ROBERTS, solicitor, of Abergystwith, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Cardiganshire (George Griffiths Williams, Esq.) to be Under-Sheriff of that County for the present year. Mr. Roberts was admitted a solicitor in 1839, and is clerk of the peace for the county, clerk to the County Roads Board, and clerk to the Commissioners of Taxes.

Mr. JOHN RICE ROBERTS, solicitor, of Beaumaris and Llangefni, has been appointed by the High Sheriff of Anglesea (Lieut.-Col. Robert Bramston Smith) to be Under-Sheriff of that County for the present year. Mr. Roberts was admitted a solicitor in 1864, and is town clerk of Beaumaris, and clerk to the borough and county magistrates, clerk to the Maltravers Marsh Commissioners, and also agent and receiver to the trustees of David Hughes' Charity.

Mr. WILLIAM STROTHER, solicitor, of Killinghall, near Ripley, Yorkshire, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women in and for the West Riding of the County of York.

Mr. FREDERICK WILLIAMS, barrister, has been appointed a Judge of the District Court in Jamaica, in the place of the late Mr. William Downing Bruce. Mr. Williams was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1869. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Easter Term, 1873, and is a member of the Midland Circuit.

Mr. HENRY WITTEY, solicitor, has been appointed one of the Assessors for Revising the List of Burgesses for the Borough of Colchester for the ensuing year. Mr. Wittey was admitted a solicitor in 1847, and is also clerk to the borough magistrates.

The office of Attorney-General for the Island of Jamaica has become vacant by the death (from yellow fever), on the 8th inst., of Mr. George Hurley Barnes, formerly of the Western Circuit, who was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1866, and had held the office for less than two years.

Obituary.

MR. JAMES READ.

Mr. James Read, solicitor, of Mildenhall and Brandon, died at his residence at the former place on the 19th ult., at the age of fifty-three. The deceased was the son of Mr. James Read, solicitor, and was born in 1823. After he was admitted a solicitor he entered into partnership with his father, to whom he had been articled. At a later period, Mr. Oddie Frederick Read, the present clerk to the borough magistrates and Commissioners of Land and Income Tax at Thetford, was also one of the firm, the business being carried on at Mildenhall, Brandon, and Thetford, but on the death of Mr. Read, sen., a dissolution took place, Mr. James Read retaining only the Mildenhall and Brandon offices. He was at the same time appointed registrar of the Mildenhall County Court (Circuit No. 33), and he was also clerk to the Mildenhall Highway Board, to the Mildenhall and Lakenheath Turnpike Trusts, and to the Commissioners of the Mildenhall Fen District. Mr. Read's private practice was very extensive, and he took a warm interest in all matters of local interest, especially the question of providing Mildenhall with railway accommodation. He was buried on Saturday, February 26, in the family grave in Mildenhall churchyard.

MR. ALBERT SMITH.

Mr. Albert Smith, who practised for many years as a solicitor at Sheffield, died at his residence, Bent's-green Lodge, on the 23rd ult., in his seventy-ninth year. The family of the deceased had been for several generations settled in the neighbourhood of Sheffield. He was the son of the Rev. George Smith, Curate of Eccleshall, was born in 1797, and was educated at the Sheffield Grammar School. Having been articled to the late Mr. Benjamin Burbeary, he was admitted a solicitor in 1818. In 1820 he became clerk to the county magistrates at Sheffield, and remained in that position for fifty-three years. He was professionally employed in obtaining the charter of incorporation for Sheffield, on the granting of which he was elected clerk to the borough magistrates. He was greatly respected by the magistrates of both jurisdictions, who derived the greatest possible assistance and support from him, and at the period of the Chartist Riots his advice was found especially valuable. Mr. Smith was also the solicitor to the original Sheffield Waterworks, and his private practice was very large. He was a perpetual commissioner for the West Riding of Yorkshire. Mr. Smith regularly discharged his duties as magistrates' clerk up to the 16th of May, 1873, when he attended for the last time, and, as his health had begun to fail, he, in the following September, resigned the appointments, being succeeded by his son and partner, Mr. R. B. Smith, who was admitted a solicitor in 1846.

MR. CHARLES JOHN ROBERTS PARRY.

Mr. Charles John Roberts Parry, solicitor, proctor, and notary (of the firm of Parry & Gamon), died at Chester on the 21st ult. The deceased was the son of Mr. Charles Thomas Wakefield Parry, the district registrar of the probate registry at Chester, and was admitted a solicitor in 1858. A few years ago he succeeded his father in the post of secretary to the Bishop of Chester and registrar of the diocese, in both of which offices his partner, Mr. John Gamon, was associated with him. He also held the registrarships of the two archdeaconries of Chester and Liverpool. He enjoyed the confidence of the bishop and of the leading clergy in the diocese, and was very highly respected in the city.

SIR RICHARD FRANCIS MORGAN.

Information has been received from Ceylon of the death of Sir Richard Francis Morgan, knight, barrister-at-law, Queen's Advocate for that island. The deceased had practised in Ceylon for thirty years, having been admitted an advocate of the Supreme Court there in 1863, and he had filled several legal offices. In 1856 he became district judge

at Colombo, and in the following year he was appointed to act as a puisne judge of the Supreme Court. He also kept his terms at Lincoln's-inn, and was called to the bar by that society in Michaelmas Term, 1858. He acted as puisne judge a second time in 1860, and he acted as Queen's Advocate in 1857, and again in 1861. In 1861 he returned to his duties as district judge, but in 1863 he received the permanent appointment of Queen's Advocate. He was knighted in July, 1874. The vacant office is worth £1,500 a year (with private practice), and is in the gift of the Secretary of State for the Colonies.

MR. RICHARD JAMES CORNER.

Mr. Richard James Corner, barrister-at-law, many years Chief Justice of the colony of British Honduras, died at East Moulsey, Surrey, on the 27th ult., at the age of seventy-one. The deceased was born in 1805, and was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Michaelmas Term, 1840. He practised for many years on the Home Circuit and Surrey Sessions, and in 1858 he was appointed Chief Justice of the Gold Coast. In 1862 he was removed to British Honduras in the same capacity, to which the duties of judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court were added in 1864. He retired on a pension in 1872, after fourteen years' colonial service.

SIR RICHARD DAVIES HANSON.

A telegram from Adelaide of the 6th inst. announces the death, at the age of seventy-one, of Sir Richard Davies Hanson, knight, Chief Justice of the colony of South Australia. The deceased judge was born in London in 1805, and (having been articled to the late Mr. John Wilks, formerly M.P. for Boston) he was admitted a solicitor in 1828, and for a short time carried on business at 3, Philpot-lane. He took a great interest in the first colonization of South Australia, though he did not accompany the first body of colonists to that district. In 1838 he accompanied the late Lord Durham to Canada, and acted as an assistant-commissioner for the purpose of inquiring into the Crown lands and immigration into that country, Mr. Charles Buller being the head of the commission. He was afterwards a resident for several years at Wellington, in New Zealand, but in 1846 he removed to Adelaide, and shortly afterwards was appointed Advocate-General of South Australia, and in 1856, on the introduction of responsible government, he became the first Attorney-General for the colony, which post he held till a change of Ministry in 1859. Two years later he was appointed Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the colony, to which were added in 1862 the duties of judge of the Vice-Admiralty Court. In 1869, while in England on leave of absence, he received the honour of knighthood, and last year he was sworn in to administer the government of the colony during the temporary absence of the governor, Mr. Musgrave.

MR. THOMAS CHAUNTLER.

Mr. Thomas Chauntler, solicitor, senior registrar of the Birmingham County Court, died suddenly at his residence, Allersley, Edgbaston, on Monday last, the 13th inst., at the age of sixty-three. Mr. Chauntler was born in 1812, and was admitted a solicitor in 1840. He soon afterwards established himself at 8, Gray's-inn-square, where he carried on business for thirty years. He was originally in partnership with Mr. William Westwood, and after that gentleman's death he, for some time, carried on business alone; but at a later period he was joined by Mr. James Washington Crouch, and more recently by Mr. William Martin Spencer. Mr. Chauntler left London in 1870, on being appointed by the late Mr. R. G. Welford, judge of county court circuit No. 21, to the office of junior registrar of the Birmingham County Court. On the death of Mr. John Guest he became senior registrar, Mr. John Cole jun., having recently become his colleague. Mr. Chauntler was actively engaged on the Friday before his death in the discharge of his official duties. On the Saturday morning he was seized with an apoplectic fit, from which he to some extent rallied, but on the Monday morning he suddenly expired. Mr. Chauntler had been for several years a widower

but has left no family. At the sitting of the county court on Monday morning, March 13, the judge, Mr. H. W. Cole, Q.C., announced Mr. Chauntler's death, and added, "The loss we sustain by his death is one which is very great, and will be so felt by myself and by every official, I am sure, connected with the court, and by the gentlemen who practise here and also by the public, for Mr. Chauntler was a gentleman who, by his extreme amiability, endeared himself to his friends, and by his great legal knowledge and his indefatigable industry he won deservedly the good opinion of everybody who was brought into contact with him." His honour expressed his regret that the pressure of business prevented him from showing his respect to Mr. Chauntler's memory by adjourning the court. Mr. Parry, on behalf of the members of the legal profession present in the court, expressed his concurrence with the remarks which had been made by the judge.

THE EARLY FRENCH BAR.

THE French bar, as understood in modern times, traces its lineage to the ordinances of St. Louis, dated in 1270, which prescribed in some measure the duties of advocates. Three things were required of them—loyalty, courtesy, and disinterestedness. It seems that it required such a quantity of words to display these three qualities that it soon became necessary to add a fourth; for, in a very few years later, brevity was also strictly enjoined; and this last quality appeared to be the most difficult of all to be attained. Before the close of the thirteenth century a magistrate gave the following charge to the bar:—"Good method is needful to advocates, and to all sorts of people who have to plead for themselves or for others; and when they set forth their pleas they should compress the facts in as few words as they can, the contention being, however, all comprised in the words; for the memory of man retains more easily a few words than many, and they are more agreeable to the judges who receive them." Again and again the courts renewed the protest against that prolixity which in early times seemed to be almost inseparable from the law, and which in a variety of forms still adheres to it. There is something even pathetic in the appeals of judges, who must have suffered much, against the prevailing redundancy of the pleadings, written and oral. Advocates were implored "to leave off all digressions in order that they might go straight to the material points, to avoid useless replies and repetitions, not to employ subterfuges and circumlocutions," which then, for the first time, began to be called chicanery.

Then, as if all patience were well-nigh lost, the charge proceeded to recommend to the bar that "in speaking they should not open their mouths inordinately wide; neither should they gesticulate at random with their hands and feet; nor disfigure their faces with contortions; nor display a great pomp in small cases; in short, that their voices and discourse should be in harmony with the subject on hand."

In those days the Court of Parliament and the advocates practising in it, who were divided into consulting advocates and speaking advocates, followed the King in all his movements; and hence was brought about a graduation of fees based in some degree, curiously enough, on the style in which the advocate travelled. A writer of that age says, "Their salary is regulated by days, according to the importance of the affair, according to their learning and their estate; for it is not reasonable that an advocate who goes on horseback should receive as large wages as one who travels with two horses, or with three or more." It would appear, therefore, that a one-horse lawyer was at the lowest grade of the profession.

The fees do not seem to have been very large, and we are told that often the lawyers pleaded without pay for relatives, "or for the poor, in the name of our Lord." They were forbidden by the rules of the order to refuse their services in defence of a party who was indigent or oppressed, under penalty of expulsion from the bar. If a lawyer practised without pay, no oath of office was administered, but he could not charge any fees until he had taken an oath of office "to maintain himself in the office of advocate well and loyally, and not knowingly to sustain any but a good and loyal cause."

It must not be supposed that when a cause was to be tried by wager of battle the lawyers had nothing to do with the

case; for the allegations on either side were drawn up by lawyers, so as to form a regular issue; and these allegations were read on the ground before the parties engaged in the combat. But here the place of the lawyer was quite subordinate; and as all the persons present would probably be anxious for the fight to begin, he was specially admonished, in matters of this kind, to be brief, and to see that his language was direct. It was also needful that he should speak with such prudence and discretion as to say nothing of his own motion tending to injure or insult the adverse party; for if he should do so, he ran a great risk of becoming a principal in a like contest, in which he would require the presence of some other lawyer to perform a similar service for himself; and at least one instance is recorded where an advocate, who was performing a professional duty of this sort, was called into the field, on wager of battle, for some unlucky word which he had inserted in his pleadings; though it is said that he got off with a good score. The odds between a lawyer, who had probably never put on a coat of mail in his life, and a knight, who had been accustomed to all military exercises from his infancy up, were obvious enough. According to the theory, indeed, this inequality was a matter of no significance, since Heaven was supposed to fight on the side of the right, and to overthrow the wicked; so that all the champion of innocence had to do was to go through the motions of a combat, in the serene confidence that his humble efforts would be rendered effectual by supernatural aid. It would seem, therefore, that the lawyer in question was a little sceptical on this point, or else that he was too modest to expect the Divine interference in his behalf.

The same barons who settled their disputes by the short arbitrament of the sword, sat in judgment between parties who preferred a more peaceable solution of their controversies. Whenever they happened to be in Paris they sat as judges, if it so pleased them, in the Court of Parliament. Fancying, as ignorant men not uncommonly do, that they had a great knack of deciding cases, they rarely missed a favourable opportunity of assuming a place on the bench. Their opinions are not cited because they gave none. Their preference was to decide in favour of the plaintiff or defendant, with but little discrimination as to details; but as sometimes nothing could be done without recourse to writings and figures, there were connected with the court certain learned men of the law, who acted as private advisers to the judges in matters of unusual difficulty. In the course of time these juriconsults as they were called, were occasionally requested to sit on the bench with the judges for the convenience of consultation and the better despatch of business; and it came to pass at last that they acquired the right to sit there, as it were by prescription, and to hold the court alone when its barons were absent, as they were for the first time during the long wars of the reign of Charles VI. Their absence enabled the administration of justice to assume a more regular form, and the law to acquire a more settled accuracy. In course of time the barons found themselves unable to keep up with these changes, which made the rude country barons ridiculous, where they had formerly been distinguished for ease and readiness of decision; and as they were not disposed to learn new things, they gradually withdrew from a court which they were no longer qualified to adorn. Thus, as the lawyers had managed to exclude the clergy from the bar, they at last supplanted the barons on the bench; a result which the latter accepted only with feelings of deep jealousy and resentment, yielding reluctantly to an influence which they could not exactly understand.

After the Court of Parliament of Paris was made sedentary in that city by an edict of Philip the Fair, the bar began to take on more regular functions; and it rapidly developed into its modern form, and acquired its modern attributes. From that time the more able, learned, and eloquent members of the bar, entering upon a more unimpeded career, rose fast to wealth, influence, and distinction; but for a long time their personal safety was extremely precarious. One of the earliest lawyers of great note who perished by violence was Jean des Mares, a humane and upright man, an accomplished jurist, an eloquent advocate. During his long life he was devoted to the Crown, and was of the greatest service in managing public affairs. When he was seventy-one years of age, a mob having broken out in the city, he addressed the infuriated populace in favour of moderation and peace. It is not known how, in doing this, he gave offence to the King, but Charles VI. commanded him

to be seized and tried for treason. He was not permitted to speak in his own defence, and was hurried to the scaffold with a hundred other citizens of Paris, and there closed an honourable life with the calmness of a philosopher, and the fortitude of a martyr. In other instances offended nobles made away with advocates whose tongues they could not otherwise silence, by assassination, sometimes private, sometimes judicial.

We have seen that in a very early period the bar had a jargon or dialect of its own; in losing this, other strange and formidable methods of speech came in vogue. Whether the example was at first set by the clergy who practised in the courts, whether it was through their more general influence, or for whatever other reason it may have been, the oral pleadings of an advocate resembled a sermon more than anything else, and invariably began with some text of Scripture which he deemed suitable to his case, or pertinent to the remarks which he had to make.

In those days a commonplace book, filled with scraps of citations from all kinds of ancient writers, on all kinds of subjects, was deemed necessary to the equipment of every advocate. Pasquier, a truly great lawyer, and an exceedingly powerful orator, was among the first to discard the sacred text at the beginning of his speeches, and to renounce the continual quotation of the older authors.

In an age of great ignorance and corruption we could hardly expect to find the bench and bar quite free from reproach; if such were the case with the French bench and bar in early times, they were maligned to an almost unexampled degree. Satirists did not spare them. One of them thus addresses the bar: "When you are in the court, and are pleading one against the other, it would seem as if you were ready to devour each other, as if you had an eager desire to protect innocence; but when you 'come out, you go to the nearest drinking-house, and there devour the substance of your clients. You are like foxes, which appear to be disposed to tear each other up, but which precipitate themselves in common upon a hen-roost, there to consume their prey." Another, no less savage, speaks of them as follows: "Is it a good thing to see the wife of an advocate, who had not ten crowns of rent after buying his office, going about dressed like a princess, with gold on her head, on her neck, on her waist, and other parts of her person? You say that this is suitable to your estate. To the devil with you, and your estate too." But the most terrible apostrophe hurled at the judges, lawyers, and all others connected with the administration of justice, was as follows: "The gentlemen of the Parliament of Paris have the most beautiful rose which there is in France (alluding to a rose-window which adorns the Palace of Justice), but it has been stained crimson with the blood of the crying and weeping poor. These gentlemen wear long robes, and their wives are dressed as princesses. If their garments were put under a press, the blood of the poor would run out. My lords jurists, are the revenues that you spend a part of your patrimony?"

However ardent may have been the feelings excited by the debates which took place in the courts, the courtesies of the bar seem to have been carefully maintained. In the trial of a cause, M. Claude Mangot, in making the closing argument, was interrupted by Versoris, whose speech he was answering. Turning to his adversary he said: "Monsieur Versoris, you do wrong to interrupt me; you have said enough already to earn your oats!" After the judgment of the court had been rendered, the president said: "Monsieur Claude Mangot, the court directs me to say that that which is given to advocates for their services is not called oats but honoraries." The reprimand was not very severe, M. Claude Mangot took it so much to heart that he became ill from it and died a few days afterwards.

As a want of space forbids a resort to proof we must rest with a well-grounded opinion, that, in point of ability, learning, and integrity, the bar contained a larger number of creditable examples than any other rank or calling in society. Pierre Flotte, a lawyer, was excommunicated by the Pope, Boniface VIII., as being "one-eyed of body, and totally blind of spirit"; but this was only for maintaining the laws against the encroachments of the Holy See. Another lawyer, Yves de Kermartin, was canonized by another Pope for the good deeds done while in the flesh. He is the only lawyer, it is said, who ever attained to that posthumous honour; he is known in the calendar as St. Yves, and is the patron saint of the French bar.—*Southern Law Review*.

Legal News.

In a case for specific performance of a contract to take a lease of a farm, tried at Lewes on Thursday week, Lord Coleridge intimated that he should abstain from directing any judgment to be entered, and leave the parties to move to set down the action on motion for judgment before the court.

The subject "On Piece Work as compared with Time Work" will be discussed at a meeting of the Social Science Association on Monday evening next, when Mr. Frederic Hill will read a paper. Leonard H. Courtney, Esq., late Professor of Political Economy at University College, will take the chair.

On Friday, March 10, in the House of Commons, Lord F. Cavendish asked what, if any, steps the Government proposed to take with respect to the report of the Legal Departments Commission, 1874. Mr. W. H. Smith said that a sufficient time had not as yet elapsed since the passing of the Judicature Act to enable the Lord Chancellor definitely to recommend the changes which might hereafter prove necessary. He could, however, assure the noble lord that steps had already been taken with a view to rendering the executive departments of the courts of law neither more nor less than was absolutely necessary for the administration of justice.

The *Times* reporter, writing from Maidstone on March 15, says:—"The business of these assizes concluded to-day—that is, it has occupied only three days, having commenced on Monday. Such an assize has never been known here before, and it presented a remarkable contrast to assizes at any time previous to the present. In the early part of the century there would have been 100 prisoners for trial here, and four or five or more were usually left for execution. About thirty years ago when Lord Denman and Baron Alderson came this circuit, the learned baron had above 100 prisoners for trial and Lord Denman tried twenty-four causes. And though the number of prisoners has been gradually reduced since then, owing to the operation of various causes, the number of civil causes for trial has never hardly been less than twenty and has generally been between twenty and thirty. At these assizes there were only twenty-seven prisoners for trial and only four causes. As regards the civil business it may safely be said that there never was known such an assize here."

On Monday a deputation, representing the Chamber of Commerce of Manchester, the Manchester Trade-Marks Association, and the United Bleachers' Association, waited upon the Lord Chancellor, at the House of Lords, in reference to the Trade-Marks Act, 1875. It was stated that no calico or goods of the class represented by the deputation could be sold in any foreign country without some distinctive mark being applied. In consequence of the expansion of commerce trade-marks had enormously increased, and it would be difficult to follow the precise provisions of the Act of 1875. The particular traders whom the deputation represented were perfectly satisfied with the working of the Act of 1862, under which priority in the adoption of a mark was accepted as a just title to the property. The bleachers were not the proprietors of any trade-marks, but would be liable to proceedings in chancery by a person claiming their ordinary stamps and trade-marks as his own. Other objections to the Act—the excessive cost which would be incurred by the act of registration of such a numerous and complicated system of trade-marks, and the cost of furnishing the registrar with blocks and copies of each mark—might be urged. Under the rules it appeared to be impossible to register any stamp which consisted merely of words. "Headings" according to the present Bill were not allowed to be described with any regard to colour, and open trade-marks had become public property, and might be claimed or assumed by any one as their own, to the exclusion of the rest of the trade. The deputation had no opportunity of adducing evidence before the committee of the House of Commons. The Bill passed that House almost before they were aware of it. The Lord Chancellor, in reply to a request for a commission of inquiry to be sent to Manchester, said he would consider what they had said, and see what course ought to be taken.

Legislation of the Week.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

March 9.—CROSSED CHEQUES.

This Bill passed through committee, after some verbal amendments had been introduced by the Lord Chancellor.

MARRIAGES (ST. JAMES, BUXTON).

This Bill passed through committee.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

This Bill was read a second time.

March 10.—APPELLATE JURISDICTION.

The report of amendments to this Bill was brought up and agreed to.

DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LAND (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS.

This Bill passed through committee.

March 13.—ST. WERBURGH'S CHURCH (BRISTOL).

This Bill was read a second time.

EPPING FOREST.

This Bill passed through committee and was reported to the House.

MARRIAGES (ST. JAMES, BUXTON).

This Bill was read a third time.

DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LAND (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS.

This Bill was read a third time.

March 14.—PATENTS FOR INVENTIONS.

This Bill was read a second time.

CROSSED CHEQUES.

On the report of amendments on this Bill, the Lord Chancellor proposed a verbal amendment in clause 5, which was agreed to.—The report was then received and adopted.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION.

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

EPPING FOREST.

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

March 9.—ROYAL TITLES.

This Bill was read a second time.

CATTLE DISEASE (IRELAND).

This Bill was read a second time.

COUNCIL OF INDIA (PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS).

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

TELEGRAPHS (MONEY).

This Bill passed through committee.

March 10.—CATTLE DISEASE (IRELAND).

The House went into committee *pro forma* on this Bill in order that certain amendments might be introduced.

TELEGRAPHS (MONEY).

This Bill was read a third time and passed.

SALMON FISHERIES.

This Bill was read a second time.

FUNDS OF MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS.

Sir S. WATERLOW introduced a Bill to amend the law relating to the application of funds of municipal corporations and other governing bodies in certain cases.

IRISH CHURCH ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. PARNELL introduced a Bill to amend the Irish Church Act of 1869 by extending to lessees and tenants holding under the Irish Church Temporalities Commissioners the right of purchasing the fee simple of their holdings, subject to the conditions allowed by section 7 of the Act of 35 & 36 Vict. c. 90, to purchasers of title rent-charge.

March 13.—DRAINAGE AND IMPROVEMENT OF LANDS (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS (No. 2).

This Bill was read a second time.

THE MANCHESTER POST-OFFICE.

This Bill passed through committee.

CORONERS (DUBLIN).

Mr. SULLIVAN introduced a Bill to amend the law relating to the number, appointment, duties, and salaries of coroners in the county of the city of Dublin.

March 15.—DIVINE WORSHIP FACILITIES.

Mr. W. EGERTON moved the second reading of this Bill, but the debate stood adjourned.

OPEN SPACES (METROPOLITAN DISTRICT).

This Bill was read a second time.

MANCHESTER POST-OFFICE.

This Bill was considered as amended.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

March 17, 1876.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 94½	Annuities, April, '88, 9½
Ditto for Account, April 1, 94½	Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908
Do 3 per Cent. Reduced, 92½	Ex Bills, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 2 dis.
New 2 per Cent., 92½	Ditto, £500, Do, 2 dis.
Do, 5½ per Cent., Jan. '74	Ditto, £100 & £200, dis.
Do, 2½ per Cent., Jan. '74	Bank of England Stock. — per
Do, 5 per Cent., Jan. '79	Ct. (last half-year), 257
Annuities, Jan. '80 —	Ditto for Account.

RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price.
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	142
Stock Caledonian	100	125½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	100
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	4½
Stock Great Northern	100	135
Stock Do., A Stock	100	135½
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	—
Stock Great Western—Original	100	100½ xd
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	134
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	115½
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	232
Stock London and North-Western	100	142½
Stock London and South-Western	100	122½
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	70½
Stock Metropolitan	100	98
Stock Do., District	100	46½
Stock Midland	100	132½
Stock North British	100	104
Stock North Eastern	100	150½
Stock North London	100	128
Stock North Staffordshire	100	71
Stock South Devon	100	70
Stock South-Eastern	100	125

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

The Bank rate has not been altered this week, and it remains at 4 per cent., although it was considered likely to have been lowered. The markets have been greatly depressed, and no less than twenty-one failures on the Stock Exchange have taken place. In the foreign market Argentine and Turkish stocks have been largely sold and show a considerable fall. The home railways have had some violent fluctuations, but, with the exception of Great Western which have fallen 3, prices are about the same as last week. Consols close at 94½ to 94½ for money and 94½ to 94½ for account.

The thirty-first annual general meeting of the Equity and Law Life Assurance Society was held on Monday last. The report states that since the last meeting of the proprietors, "a bonus has been divided which has given great satisfaction; the accounts now submitted relate, therefore, to the first year of the new quinquennium, and show a continuance of a large and satisfactory business. The number of new policies issued during the year 1875 was 201, assuring £461,336, the premiums on which amounted to £17,158. Of this, however, a large amount had to be re-assured: deducting the re-assurances, the net new sums assured amount to £318,366, and the net new annual premiums to £7,949 12s., and the net new single premiums to £4,254 8s. 2d., making together £12,204 0s. 2d. The income from renewal premiums amounted, after deduction of the premiums on re-assurances, to £108,992 15s. 4d., showing an increase over the amount in the previous year's account of £3,624 4s. 8d. The amount of interest and dividends was £42,276 11s., and is rather smaller than in the previous year, although the funds of the society have been largely increased. This has

arisen from two causes, viz., the repayment of an unusual amount of loans throwing a large amount of money on our hands for some time, and secondly, by the large amount which has been added to the reversions held by the society, which have increased in the course of the year by nearly £60,000. The item "Profit on Reversions, £10,662 17s. 2d." consists of sums received on reversions which have fallen into possession during the year over and above the amounts at which they were valued on the 31st of December, 1874. The claims by death have amounted to £82,702 7s. 6d., after deduction of re-assurances, and are less than they were in 1874: they exceed the expected amount by about £2,000 only. The surrenders are large in amount as compared with 1874. This has arisen probably from many policyholders having waited for the declaration of the bonus before surrendering their policies. A similar sudden rise in the amount paid for surrenders occurred in 1870, after which it again declined. The expenses of management are larger than in the previous year; the greater portion of the increase is, however, temporary, being connected with the distribution of the bonus. The total income of the society during the year amounted to £193,506 9s. 7d., and the total expenditure to £144,116 15s. 4d., so that the assets of the society have increased by £49,389 14s. 3d. In the item of expenditure, however, is included the amount of cash bonus paid, which is £22,202 14s. This forms a part of the profit made in the last quinquennium. Deducting the reversions, outstanding premiums, and cash on current account, the remainder of the funds of the society was invested at an average rate of £4 19s. 11d. per cent.; or, including the reversions, and assuming that they produce 26 per cent., the average rate realized becomes £5 5s. 3d."

DEATHS.

BARNE—March 8, at Kingston, Jamaica, George Hurley Barne, Attorney-General of that island, second son of the late John Barne, of Tiverton, Devon.
HAYS—March 10, at 7, Roydon-villas, Clifton, the residence of his sister, Thomas Davey Hays, barrister-at-law, aged 37.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

FRIDAY, March 10, 1876.

Culshaw, James Blundell, and Edward Roberts, 71, Lord st, Liverpool, Lancashire, Solicitors. Feb 15

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

FRIDAY, March 10, 1876.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Manchester Provident Assurance Society.—Petition for winding up, presented March 9, directed to be heard before V.C. Malins on Friday, March 24. Clarke and Co, Lincoln's inn fields, agents for Hartcup and Sons, Bangay, solicitors for the petitioner

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Cestrian Clothing Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before April 3, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thomas Dean Sutcliffe, Gloucester place, City rd, Hulme, Manchester. Monday, April 10, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Co-operative Bank, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented March 6, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on March 17. Blagden, Great Winchester st, solicitor for the petitioner.

Gwendraeth Valley Colliery Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before April 10, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Frederick Maynard, Queen Victoria st. Tuesday, April 25, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Ouseburn Engine Works Company, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before April 10, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to John George Benson and William Nuttall, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Monday, May 8, at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

Taurine Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before April 11, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William Williams, Basinhall st. Tuesday, April 25, at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

TUESDAY, March 14, 1876.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

London and Eastern Banking Corporation.—V.C. Baron, at his chambers, on Wednesday, March 22, at 12, will appoint John Ball, sole above official manager of the corporation.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

Coal Consumers' Association, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Malins, dated March 3, it was ordered that the above association be wound up. Bell and Co., agents for Rodgers and Co, Sheffield, solicitors for the petitioners.
Great Mountain Silver Lead Mining Company, Limited.—Petition for

winding up, presented March 11, directed to be heard before V.C. Mallins on March 24. Foster, Queen street place, solicitor for the petitioner.

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, March 10, 1876.

Harrington Friendly Society, Harrington, Worcester. March 6.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, March 3, 1876.

Balls, Charles Rayner, Forest gate, Stratford, Essex, Gent. April 1.
Balls v Hockley, M.R. Jackson, Essex st, Strand.
Balls, Henry, Hackney rd, Licensed Victualler. April 1. Balls v Hockley, M.R. Jackson, Essex st, Strand.
Barnes, John, Iken, Suffolk, Farmer. April 6. Barnes v Mills, V.C. Hall. Southwell, Saxmundham.
Rickaby, James. Kirby Moorside, York, Mason. April 3. Foxton v Jackson, V.C. Hall. Petch, Kirby Moorside.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, March 3, 1876.

Alexander, Captain John Hothouse Ingle, Granville place, Portman square, R.N. May 1. Young and Co, St Mildred's court, Poultry.
Austin, Rebecca, Devonshire rd, Holloway. April 15. Scadding, Gordon st, Gordon square.
Baumant, Hector Moorhouse, Huddersfield, York, Woollen Merchant. May 1. Bottomley, Huddersfield.
Bindley, Edward, Wolvey, Warwick, Schoolmaster. April 13. Pilgrim and Preston, Hinxley.
Blankley, Robert, Stroxtun, Lincoln, Farmer. May 1. Thompson and Sons, Grantham.
Bowen, Thomas, Bishop's Castle, Salop, Farmer. April 3. Newell, Bishop's Castle.
Eowman, Frederic, Duddington, Northampton, Esq. May 1. Thompson and Sons, Grantham.
Brice, Philip Lawrence, Misterton, Somerset, Carpenter. April 8. Sparks, Crewkerne.
Bristow, John William, Eusemere hill, Westmorland, Major General Bengal Staff Corps. March 25. Bleaymire and Shepherd, Penrith.
Christie, Robert, St Leonards-on-Sea, Sussex, Wine Merchant. April 8. Cooper and Walker, Billiter.
Cobbett, Daniel Addington, Fenchurch st, Architect. April 20. Gosset, Coleman st.
Divers, Elizabeth Ann, Dover, Kent, Hotel Keeper. April 1. Fielding, Dover.
Edginton, William, Mangersbury, Gloucester, Yeoman. May 20. Francis, Stow-on-the-Wold.
Elwell, Charles John, Tettenhall, Stafford, Merchant. April 26. Thorne and Co, Wolverhampton.
Fairbank, John Tertius, Bradford, York, Architect. May 5. Gill and Hall, Wakefield.
Farrington, Edmund Richard, Bartlett's buildings, Esq. April 10. Braikenridge, Bartlett's buildings.
Forster, Thomas, Richford st, Hammersmith, Esq. April 17. Young and Co, St Mildred's court, Poultry.
Gibson, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Boot Maker. April 13. Allan and Davies, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Griffin, Anne, Bristol. April 5. Dix, Bristol.
Gullan, Archibald Black, Swansea, Glamorgan, Merchant. April 3. Strick and Bellingham, Swansea.
Hall, William, Wharrah-le-street, York, Farmer. April 22. Botterill, Great Driffield.
Handyside, John, Acklam, York, Farmer. May 5. Gray and Pannett, Whitby.
Hare, Edward, St Paul st, Islington, Carpenter. April 14. W. S. Quick, Stann st, Chelsea.
Harris, William, Leigh, Kent, Farmer. March 27. Holcroft and Co, Sevenoaks.
Henry, Frederic, East India Dock rd, Poplar, Gent. April 1. Baker and Nairne, Crosby square.
Holt, James, Bacup, Lancashire, Yeoman. April 7. Stansfield and Sager, Todmorden.
Howarth, Thomas, Wallingeh-in-Howick, Lancashire, Bleacher. April 1. Rushton and Co, Bolton-le-Moors.
Ingram, Lionel, Hedgeman's Farm, Essex, Yeoman. March 31. Mercer and Co, Deal.
James, Thomas Gates, St Mark's crescent, Regent's park, Gent. May 1. Richardson and Sadler, Golden square.
Little, James Henderson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Gas Engineer. May 1. Bond, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
Logan, Sarah, Leeds, York. March 21. Newstead and Wilson, Leeds.
Mann, William, Brington, Huntingdon, Gent. May 1. Margetta and Son, Huntingdon.
Marshall, Robert, Studdale, Kent, Farmer. April 1. Fielding, Dover.
Mitchell, Sarah, High st, Shadwell. April 15. Ratcliffe and Son, New Broad st.
Myman, David, Clifton, Bristol, Esq. April 1. Salmon and Henderson, Bristol.
Omerod, John, Todmorden, York, Cab Proprietor. April 7. Stanfield and Sager, Todmorden.
Ormerod, Peter, Hillwell Hall, Lancashire, Esq. April 1. Rushton and Co, Bolton-le-Moors.
Preston, William, Benefield, Northampton, Farmer. April 15. Beedham and Son, Kimbilton.
Sell, Richard, Bristol. Aug 21. Sisley, Gilmore rd, Lewisham.
Smith, Thomas, Ulverston, Lancashire, Farmer. April 1. Woodburne and Poole, Ulverston.
Sturgeon, Charles Fisk, Sherborne, Hampshire. April 30. Latter and Willet, Bromley.
Swaine, William Harrop, Queen's buildings, Tottenham court rd, Trimming Manufacturer. April 8. Kelahely and Co, Philipot lane.
Tandy, Edward, Foxhall Heath, Worcester, Innkeeper. March 25. Hughes, Worcester.
Thackray, Charity, York. April 1. Newton and Co, York.
Topham, James, Boroughbridge, York, Yeoman. April 6. Hirst and Capes, Boroughbridge.

Tuesday, March 7, 1876.

Amphlett, Louisa, Hampton Bishop, Hereford. March 31. Symonds, Hereford.
Buckland, Frances, Leamington, Warwick. March 31. James and Oerton, Birmingham.
Buckley, Richard Wilson, Lincoln's inn fields, Esq. April 20. Greenbank, Serjeants' inn, Fleet st.
Cadbury, Henry, Birmingham, Chocolate Manufacturer. April 17. Wills and Newry, Birmingham.
Connacher, Duncan, Hampstead rd, Dentist. April 3. Greenhill, Gracchurth st.
Deacon, Alfred Charles, Barclay rd, Waltham green, Gent. April 15. Ellis and Co, St Swithin's lane.
Gate, John, Herne Hill, Surrey, Esq. May 1. Richardson and Sadler, Golden square.
Hargreaves, Thomas, Withington, Manchester, Gent. May 1. Farrar and Hall, Manchester.
Headesch, Elizabeth, Henrietta st, Bath. April 20. Gibbs, Jun Bath.
Hendrie, Elizabeth, Pontonville rd. April 31. Van Sandan and Cummings, King st, Cheapside.
Huddleston, John, Manchester, Boot Manufacturer. April 13. Seaburne and Co, Manchester.
Hurst, Rev Samuel Sheppard, Southtown, Suffolk. May 1. Worship and Rising, Great Yarmouth.
Nash, Mary Ann, Elm grove, Hammersmith. May 1. Cox and Sons, Cloak lane.
Neck, John Knill, Doris st, West Kennington rd, Esq. April 19. Rhodes and Son, Chancery lane.
Nichols, Mary Ann, Penzance, Cornwall. May 4. Roscorla and Son, Penzance.
Osborne, Charles, Birmingham, Gun Manufacturer. April 13. Polnton, Birmingham.
Rich, Elizabeth, Croydon, Surrey. April 20. Rogers and Co, Jermy st.
Sallows, Elizabeth, East Bergholt, Suffolk. June 1. Howard and Co, Colchester.
Stent, Elizabeth, Dorking, Surrey. April 25. Jones and Co, Tooley st, Southwark.
Stutfield, Fred, Green hill, Halifax, York, Woolstapler. April 1. Hill, Halifax.
Taylor, Sir Henry George Andrew, Clarendon place, Hyde park, Kent, and General in H.M.'s Army. May 30. Francis, Austin triars.
Weekly, Richard, Harmondsworth, Middlesex, Farmer. April 29. Wills, Uxbridge.
Wilson, Mary Ann, Titchfield, Hants. April 11. Gobbs, Fareham.
Yates, John, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Gent. March 31. Harrison, Fowles buildings, Great Tower st.
Yeates, Henry Brettergh, Brettergh Holt, Westmorland. May 1. Harrison and Son, Kendal.

FRIDAY, March 10, 1876.

Anderson, William, Shipton, York, Draper. April 3. Grayson, York.
Banks, Mary, Liverpool. March 30. Scott, King William st, City.
Beckley, Henry, Alderhot, Major H. M.'s 105th Reg of Foot. April 3. East ey, Paignton.
Brown, Eliza, Epworth, Lincoln. June 24. Sharp, Epworth.
Buck, Sarah Ann, Spenny Moor, Durham. April 1. Thornton, Bishop Auckland.
Burrow, Marianne, Ilfracombe, Devon. April 10. Meade-King and Biggs, Bristol.
Borrow, Charles Henry, Bromley, Kent, Wine Merchant. April 7. Van Sandan and Cummings, King st, Cheapside.
Campbell, Joseph, Childerditch, Essex, Farmer. April 13. Postans and London, South square, Gray's inn.
Cockle, Henry, Deptford bridge, Solicitor. May 10. Sandom and Kersey, Gracechurch st.
Collier, Ann, Ashill, Somerset. April 5. Paull, Ilminster.
Constable, John, Union rd, Rotherhithe, Printer. May 1. Buchanas, Basinghall st.
Dunne, Anne, Adam st, Baker st. May 1. Bivan and Whitting, Old Jewry.
English, Rev John Francis Hawker, Great Warley, Essex. April 20. Kinsey and Ade, Bloomsbury place.
Farrant, George Binstead, Green st, Grosvenor square, Esq. May 1. Smith, Lincoln's inn fields.
Fisk, William, Liverpool, Confectioner. April 1. Jevons and Ryley, Liverpool.
Gibb, Benjamin, Wickham terrace, Deptford, Gent. April 30. Horne and Hunter, Lincoln's inn fields.
Gordon, Katharine Sarah, Exbury, Torquay, Devon. April 10. Allis and Greenop, St Peter's alley, Cornhill.
Gore, Catherine, Bristol. May 1. Wynns and Son, Lincoln's inn fields.
Greaves, Joseph, Harpurhey, nr Manchester, Gent. April 25. Farrar and Hall, Manchester.
Hardings, Henry, Grafton st, Berkeley square, Doctor of Medicine. April 25. Boxall, Chancery lane.
Hooker, Rev William, Buckenell, Devon. May 1. Margotta and Son, Haddington.
Hodge, John, Milton, Devon, Gent. May 5. Whitford and Bennett, Plymouth.
Holroyd, Sarah Louisa, Wimbledon. April 15. Valpy and Chaplin, Lincoln's inn fields.
Kaye, Joseph Henry, Melbourne, Victoria, Captain R.N. April 15. Clarke and Co, Gresham House, Old Broad st.
Lea, Joseph Wakeman, Warwick gardens, Kensington, Gent. April 29. Lindsey and Co, Basinghall st.
Manns, Simon, Clatham, Kent, Coal Factor. June 11. Essell and Co, Rochester.
Matison, Elizabeth, Liverpool. May 1. Pierce, Liverpool.
Matthews, Thomas, Great Berkhamstead, Hertford, Carpenter. April 15. Bullock, Great Berkhamstead.
Moss, Charles, Suffolk, Essex, Esq. April 15. Worthington and Co, Eastcheap.
Pierce, James, Blackburn, Lancashire, Gent. April 10. Morris, Chorley.
Plewden, George Augustus Chishole, York place, Portman square. April 12. Lott, Great George st, Westminster.
Roe, Frederic John, Southsea, Hants, Grocer's Assistant. April 18. Ellison and Barrows, Cambridge.

Beymour, Edward William, Forthmaur, Brecon. May 9. Marriott and Jordan, Westminster chambers, Victoria st
Singer, Isaac Merritt, Paignton, Devon. May 1. Eastly, Paignton
Solomons, John, Northumberland terrace, Regent's park rd. April 5.
Solomons, King st, Chesapeake
Stock, Giles, Bristol, Butcher. April 3. Horne and Hunter, Lincoln's inn fields
Sturges, Joseph, New Bond st, Esq. April 1. Taylor and Co, Bradford
Tayler, Joseph, Great Bentley, Essex, Hay Dealer. March 30. Pope, Colchester
Watson, Elizabeth, Colchester, Essex. June 1. Bircham and Co, Parliament st, Westminster
Williams, John Fisher, Queen's square, Bloomsbury, Merchant. July 1
Cowell and Co, Budge row
Yates, John, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Gent. March 31. Harrison's, Fowkes buildings, Great Tower st

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, March 10, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Fox, John Henry, Fleet st, Cigar Merchant. Pet March 7. Hazlitt. March 27 at 12
Myer, Isaac, The Avenue, Balisze park. Pet March 7. Hazlitt. March 21 at 12.30

To Surrender in the Country.

Oliver, James, and Thomas Austin, St Leonard's-on-Sea, Sussex, Grocers. Pet March 6. Young. Hastings, March 21 at 12
Lower, Edward George, Plymouth, Devon, Brewer. Pet March
Gidley. East Storehouse, March 30 at 12
Price, John, Bristol, Solicitor. Pet Feb 28. Harley. Bristol, March 21 at 2
Whittle, William, Acock's green, nr Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. Pet March 6. Cole. Birmingham, March 21 at 11

TUESDAY, March 14, 1876.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Summers, Frederick, St Augustine's rd, Camden square, Engraver. Pet March 9. coys. March 23 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Alexander, George, Manchester, Merchant. Pet March 9. Kay. Manchester, March 30 at 10
Cadman, John, Orrell, nr Wigan, Lancashire, Tobaccoist. Pet March 9. Woodcock. Wigan, March 29 at 11
Edmonds, Henry, Birmingham, Grocer. Pet March 10. Cole. Birmingham, March 30 at 12
Hurst, William and Robert Munn, Liverpool, Cotton Brokers. Pet March 10. Watson. Liverpool, March 27 at 2
Mackay, E. Salisbury, Wilts, Boot Maker. Pet March 10. Wilson. Salisbury, March 25 at 1
Kay, Samuel Spr. ntal, Bridlington Quay, York, Innkeeper. Pet March 9. Woodall. Scarborough, March 24 at 3
Paisos, William Starr, Hereford, out of business. Pet March 9. Carless, jun. Hereford, March 25 at 11
Radcliffe, Thomas Morris, Walton-on-the-Naze, Essex, Licensed Victualler. Pet March 8. Barnes. Colchester, March 25 at 2

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

TUESDAY, March 14, 1876.

Gordon, Wallace, Tanbridge Wells, Kent, Toy Dealer. March 10
Wood, George, Junction rd, Highgate. March 4

Liquidation by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, March 10, 1876.

Alington, Henry Edward, Eccles, Lancashire, Joiner. March 28 at 11 at offices of Jones, Princess st, Manchester
Aldred, Robert, Hattersage, Derby, Licensed Victualler. March 20 at 12 at the George Hotel, Market place, Sheffield. Hextall, Derby
Allison, William, West Hartlepool, Durham, Cordwainer. March 29 at 3 at offices of Bell, Church st, West Hartlepool
Ayers, John, Castlethorpe Wharf, Northampton, Innkeeper. March 27 at 2 at the Cock Hotel, Stony Stratford. Parrott, Stony Stratford
Babb, Walter Webber, Bristol, Chemist. March 20 at 2 at offices of Sibley, Exchange west, Bristol
Barker, John, Ludworth, Derby, out of business. March 23 at 3 at offices of Smith, H. do
Barnley, John Allen, Birmingham, Estate Agent. March 22 at 3 at offices of Wood and Son, Waterloo st, Birmingham
Bean, James, Northport st, Hoxton, Confectioner. March 20 at 12 at offices of Tinsley, Abchurch yard, Cannon st
Bennett, George Henry, H. ylands, nr Ryde, Isle of Wight, Grocer. March 23 at 10 at the Vine Hotel, West Cowes. Joyce
Bennett, William David, Farnham, Surrey, Draper. March 29 at 12 at the Lion and Lamb Hotel, Farnham. Holmes and Mason, Farnham
Benson, Joseph Henry, Beckington, Somerset, Surgeon. March 23 at 3 at offices of Crutwell and Co, Bath st, Frouse
Birke, Charles, Great Fenton, Stafford, Beerseller. March 21 at 11 at offices of Tennant, Chesapeake, Hanley
Bradbury, Joseph, Macclesfield, Cheshire, Card Manufacturer. March 29 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Macclesfield. May
Bromwich, William Cox, Birmingham, Drysalter. March 22 at 11 at offices of Parr, Colmore row, Birmingham
Cannell, Mary, Wednesbury, Stafford, Innkeeper. March 23 at 3 at offices of Dale, Bennett's hill, Birmingham
Carter, Henry, Marazion, Cornwall, Grocer. March 25 at 11 at offices of Trythall, Clarence st, Finsance
Cookrell, John Edward, Manchester, Oil Merchant. March 31 at 4 at offices of Best, Lower King st, Manchester
Cohen, Israel, Birmingham, Jeweller's Factor. March 22 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Birmingham. Hodgson, Birmingham
Cows, John, Ivybridge, Devon, Butcher. March 23 at 11 at offices of Rodda, Westwall st, Plymouth
Daniel, John, Merthyr Tydfil, Glamorgan, Innkeeper. March 22 at 12 at offices of Rodda, Westwall st, Merthyr Tydfil
Davies, Alfred Leonard, Llanelli, nr Birmingham, Jeweller. March 24 at 3 at offices of Parry, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

DeLaforce, Edward James, Pritchard's place, Hackney, Beer Retailer. March 20 at 3 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st. Ede, Bells vine cottages, South Hackney
Dellow, William, Turner's rd, Limehouse, Carman. March 18 at 10.15 at offices of Hicks, Globe rd, Mile end
Dockray, Joseph, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Grocer. March 24 at 3 at the Sun Hotel, Ramsden st, Barrow-in-Furness. Nalder, Barrow-in-Furness
Drage, Thomas Edwin, Walworth rd, Grocer. March 20 at 3 at offices of Bath and Co, King William st. Clippesfield, Trinity st, Southwark
Eadie, David Haggie, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Grocer. March 23 at 11 at offices of Keenlyside and Forster, St John's chambers, Grainger st west, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
Elsworth, Joseph, Todmorden, York, Stone Mason. March 24 at 11.30 at offices of Eastwood, Masonic Hall, Todmorden
Fairley, John, Coventry, Watch Manufacturer. March 22 at 12 at offices of Munster, Trinity churchyard, Coventry
Farrall, Thomas, Brindley Ford, Tailor. March 22 at 11 at offices of Hollishead, Market st, Tunstall
Francis, Edwin, Stratford-upon-Avon, Warwick, Ironfounder. March 25 at 10.20 at the Red Horse Hotel, Bridge st, Stratford-upon-Avon. Greves, Stratford-upon-Avon
Froggart, Joseph, Highnam, York, C. liery Deputy. March 24 at 11 at offices of Marshall and Owsoworth, Churchst, Barneley
Fullicks, Richard, Metropolitan Meat Market, Meat Salesman. March 20 at 3 at offices of Lewis, Hatton garden, Holborn
Gibbs, John, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Stafford, Draper. March 23 at 3 at offices of Turner, Bagnall st, Newcastle-under-Lyme
Gill, Peter, and William Gill, Tollerston, York, Millers. March 23 at 1 at offices of Paley, Fairsgate, York
Girling, John George, Devizes, Wilts, Carrier. March 24 at 2.30 at the Bear Hotel, Devizes. Wilton, Bath
Gregory, John Turner, Sheffield, Estate Agent. March 23 at 12 at offices of Leggoe, George st, Sheffield. Stacey
Guard, James, Lower Hopcott, Somerset, Yeoman. March 24 at 1 at the Wellington Hotel, Minehead. Watkins, Bristol
Hall, Henry, Tredegar, Monmouth, Grocer. March 29 at 1 at offices of Williams and Co, The Exchange, Bristol. Lloyd
Hamilton, William Branker, Bradford, York, Grocer Manufacturer. March 23 at 11 at offices of Berry and Robinson, Charles st, Bradford
Harfield, Ellis, Bow lane, Chesapeake, Woolen Warehouseman. March 24 at 11 at the Queen's Hotel, Leeds. Gammon, Bargo yard, Bask-lersbury
Heath, Thomas, Longton, Stafford, Joiner. March 20 at 11 at 23, Commerce st, Longton. Marflet
Heath, William, Mortimer st, Regent st, Engraver. March 29 at 2 at offices of Slater and Fannell, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st. Wright and Nicoll, Great Portland st
Hemingway, Edward, Attercliffe, Sheffield, Draper. March 23 at 11 at offices of Binney and Sons, Queen st chambers, St. Field
Hoare, William Stephen, Denbigh st, Fimlico, Builder. March 27 at the Grosvenor Hotel, Buckingham Palace rd
Horton, James, Worcester, Rope Manufacturer. March 23 at 3 at offices of Pitt, The Avenue, Cross, Worcester
Howard, Charles William, A'dgate High st, Carrier. March 29 at 12 at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate st within. Carter and Bell, East-champ
Hunt, William Chambers, Ipswich, Suffolk, Boot Maker. March 23 at 12 at Pearce's Rooms, Princes st. Birch, Ipswich
Jones, Enoch William, Brynmawr, Brecon, Grocer. March 23 at 11 at offices of Davies, Tredegar
Jones, James, Birmingham, Marine Store Dealer. March 18 at 11 at offices of Smith, Temple st, Birmingham
Jones, Rebekkah, Upper Wimpole st, Lodging House Keeper. March 24 at 4 at 7, Bouverie st. Paterson
Kemp, Frances Constantia, Bilston, Stafford, Stationer. March 24 at 11 at offices of James, Oxford st, Bilston
King, Charles, Aberford, York, Farmer. March 29 at 12 at offices of Keil, Wetherby
King, John, Newark-upon-Trent, Nottingham, Coal Merchant. March 24 at 3 at offices of Press, Friar lane, Nottingham. Black, Nottingham
Kendall, George, Manchester, Builder. March 24 at 4 at offices of Best, Lower King st, Manchester
Knott, Alfred, Kidderminster, Worcester, Grocer. March 29 at 3 at offices of Saunders son, and Barber, Church st, Kidderminster
Lewis, Robert, Thelwall, Cheshire, Baker. March 24 at 3 at offices of Brotherton, Bann st, Warrington
Lewthwaite, John, Halifax, Commission Agent. March 23 at 11 at offices of Rhodes, Horton st, Halifax
Longman, Eustace Barron, Feuchurch st, Wine Merchant. March 20 at 2 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Blake, Newport, I.W.
Lowe, Frederick George, and James Rowan, Mincing lane, Tea Merchants. March 24 at 1 at 6, Great James st, Bedford row. Soden
Marsh, William Alfred, Swansea, Glamorgan, Grocer. March 20 at 3 at offices of Glascoine, Fisher st, Swansea
Mella, Charles, Birmingham, Draper. March 22 at 2 at the Queen's Hotel, New st, Birmingham. Ryland and Co, Birmingham
Morley, William Henry, Hanley, Stafford, Commission Agent. March 23 at 11 at offices of Vaddick and son, Old Hall st, Hanley
Morris, Francis, Liverpool, Confectioner. March 27 at 2 at offices of Roome and Price, North John st, Liverpool. Bellingier, Liverpool
Mottin, John Baylis, Nuneaton, Warwick, Beerhouse Keeper. March 23 at 11 at offices of Wood, Nuneaton
Nash, Daniel, Smethwicke, Stafford, out of business. March 21 at 12 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham
Parker, Anthony, Derby, Grocer. March 23 at 2 at offices of Flint, Full st, Derby
Parsons, Alfred Russell, Uckfield, Sussex, Grocer. March 23 at 12 at offices of Smith and Co, Broad st, Chesapeake. Lane, Brighton
Pattison, William Dickson, Leeds, Grocer. March 25 at 3 at offices of Turner, East parade, Leeds
Pescott, Henry, Brighton, Sussex, Sawyer. March 31 at 3 at offices of Nye, North st, Brighton
Peet, John, Nottingham, Commercial Traveller. March 27 at 19 at offices of Brittle, St Peter's chambers, St Peter's gate, Nottingham

- Flowman, George, Manchester, Wood Turner. March 24 at 3 at offices of Payne, Kennedy st, Manchester. Simpson, Manchester
- Pullard, James, Tottersdown, nr Bristol, Draper. March 25 at 11 at offices of Miller, Whitson chambers, Nicholas st, Bristol
- Pye, Robert, Norwich, Plumber. March 24 at 4 at offices of Stanley, Bank plain, Norwich
- Quick, Sarah, Swansea, Glamorgan, Dealer in Fancy Goods. March 22 at 3 at offices of Smith and Co, Somerset place, Swansea
- Roberts, Thomas, and John Roberts, Birmingham, Corn Factors. March 21 at 12 at the Great Western Hotel, Monmouth st, Birmingham. Boiler and Slicks, Birmingham
- Robinson, William, Middleborough, York, Journeysman Shoe Maker. March 30 at 3 at offices of Teale, Albert rd, Middlesborough
- Rositer, John Robert, Treherbert, Glamorgan, Grocer. March 21 at 12 at offices of Beddoe, Canon st, Aberdare
- Samber, Alberine, Sunderland, Durham, Ship Broker. March 23 at 11 at offices of Sinner, John st, Sunderland
- Small, John, Birmingham, Baddest Manufacturer. March 24 at 12 at offices of Southall and Co, Newhall st, Birmingham
- Smith, Samuel Bilton, Peterborough, Northampton, Solicitor. March 23 at 11 at the Wentworth Hotel, Peterborough. Deacon and Wilkins, Peterborough
- Snowden, George, Halifax, York, Tailor. March 29 at 3 at offices of Rhodes, Horton st, Halifax
- Snowsell, Edwin, Swansea, Glamorgan, Confectioner. March 22 at 11 at offices of Davies and Harland, Ratand st, Swansea
- Spencer, Tom, Barrow-upon-Soar, Leicester, Tailor. March 27 at 3 at offices of Wright, Belvoir st, Leicester
- Sprowlies, Francis, Bristol, Grocer. March 20 at 12 at offices of Sheridan, Nicholas st, Bristol
- Stonehouse, James, Fairfield, nr Liverpool, Market Superintendent. March 24 at 3 at offices of Gibson and Bolland, South Joan st, Liverpool
- Stott, George, and George William Stott, Alnwick, Northumberland, Merchant Tailors. March 22 at 3 at offices of Nicholson, Bridge st, Morpeth
- Taylor, Ebenezer, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk, Baker. April 1 at 12 at the Guildhall, Bury St Edmunds. Salmon and Son
- Taylor, William Henry, Osselt, York, Beerhouse Keeper. March 24 at 11 at offices of Walker, Wakefield rd, Dewsbury
- Thacker, Joseph George, Osley Hay, Stafford, Builder. March 23 at 3 at offices of Dale, Bennett's hill, Birmingham
- Thompson, John, Lincoln, Draper. March 24 at 3 at 8, York st, Manchester. Sole and Co, Manchester
- Veal, Frederick, Walsow, Somerset, Miller. March 21 at 11 at 3, Wood st, Bath. Moger
- Ward, Samuel, Mansfield, Nottingham, Butcher. March 28 at 2 at house of Wildsmith, Stonehill gate, Mansfield
- Webb, William, and Joseph Webb, Leeds, Carvers. March 20 at 3 at offices of Ford and Son, Albion st, Leeds
- Wharf, Richard, Barrow-in-Furness, Butcher. March 22 at 10 at the Victoria Hotel, Church st, Barrow-in-Furness. Bradshaw and Pearson, Barrow-in-Furness
- White, William, Lincoln, drifter. March 15 at 11 at offices of Jay, Bank st, Lincoln. Page, Jia, Flaxen gate, Lincoln
- Williams, Arthur Davis, Gilwern, Brecon, Grocer. March 28 at 2 at offices of Jones, Frigmore st, Abergavenny
- Williams, Frederick Thomas, Leominster, Hereford, Innkeeper. March 27 at 11 at offices of Sampson, Corn square, Leominster. Garrold, Hereford
- Wilton, William, West Hartlepool, Durham, Glass Dealer. March 24 at 3 at the Regent Hotel, West Hartlepool. Wilmot, West Hartlepool
- Winsten, James, Leeds, Chair Maker. March 20 at 2 at offices of Walker, East parade, Leeds
- Wormon, Reuben, Bradford, York, Wood Dealer. March 27 at 3.30 at offices of Neill, Kirkgate, Bradford
- Wright, William, Holmfirth, York, Confectioner. March 23 at 3 at offices of Boon, Holmfirth
- Wright, William, Sunderland, Durham, Boot Dealer. March 27 at 11 at offices of Oliver and Butterell, John st, Sunderland
- Tuesday, March 14, 1876.
- Adcock, Frederick, Kingsbury, Warwick, Miller. March 30 at 11 at the Hen and Chickens Hotel, New st, Birmingham. Argyle and Sons, Tamworth
- Aitchison, Richard Robinson, South Shields, Durham, Hosier. March 27 at 3 at offices of Smith, Saville st, North Shields
- Anderson, James, Middlesbrough, York, Bedding Manufacturer. April 3 at 3 at Barker's Temperance Hotel, Lintorps rd, Middlesbrough. Beinbridge, Middlesbrough
- Archer, Thomas, Balsall Heath, Worcester, Balder. March 27 at 11 at offices of Farr, Compton row, Birmingham
- Ashham, George Walter, Liverpool, Draper. March 31 at 3 at offices of Lowe, Castle st, Liverpool
- Atkins, Arthur James, Bilport st, Blainford square, Journeysman Carpenter. March 23 at 10 at the Albert Hotel, Cornwall rd, Westbourne park
- Barnett, Joseph, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Tailor. March 25 at 11 at offices of Hill, Queen's square, Wolverhampton
- Baxter, Henry, Stanground, Huntingdon, Bootwright. March 27 at 12 at offices of Gaches, Cathedral gateway, Peterborough
- Bedford, Winifred, Wantage, Berks, Smith. March 27 at 12 at offices of Jetcham, Wantage
- Bennett, William, Long Buckby, Nottingham, Miller. March 29 at 3 at offices of Shoosmith, Newland, Nottingham
- Box, John, Western cottages, North End rd, Hammermith, Boot Maker. March 30 at 2 at Maule's Hotel, Ironmonger lane, Seymour, Copthall building
- Bradsheaw, Felix Augustus, Wandsworth rd, Mantle Manufacturer. April 3 at 3 at offices of Howse, Staple inn, Holborn. Morris, Staple inn, Holborn
- Bristow, Joseph, Chisle, Sussex, Brick Maker. March 28 at 11 at offices of Holman, High st, St Michael's, Lewes
- Brunskill, John, Skeiton, York, Auctioneer. March 24 at 2 at offices of Garbutt and Fawcett, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
- Buckingham, James, Welton, Gloucester, Innkeeper. March 28 at 11 at the Unicorn Inn, Bridge Foot, Stratford-upon-Avon. Graves, Stratford-upon-Avon
- Burnage, Julius, Compton, Beds, Baker. March 16 at 3 at the George Hotel, Luton. Fenton, Albion terrace, Kingsland
- Barton, Joseph, Bournemouth, Hants, Grocer. March 23 at 2 at the Board Room, Town Hall, Bournemouth. Webb
- Cameron, John, East rd, City rd, Timber Merchant. March 27 at 2.30 at offices of Brown, Finsbury place
- Cantrell, William Henry, Essex rd, Islington, Draper. March 27 at 12 at offices of Plunkett, Gutter lane
- Carter, Edward, Maiden rd, Kentish town, Pork Butcher. March 21 at 3 at offices of Arnold, Finsbury pavement
- Clough, George Smyth, Bedford, Commercial Clerk. March 30 at 11 at offices of Conquest and Clars, Duke st, Bedford
- Collins, William, Middlesbrough, York, Oil Dealer. March 23 at 2 at offices of Garbutt and Fawcett, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
- Coulthard, Mary Ann, Stockton-on-Tees, Durham, Innkeeper. March 24 at 11 at offices of Garbutt and Fawcett, Finkle st, Stockton-on-Tees
- Cross, John, Bilton, Stafford, Butcher. March 21 at 10.30 at offices of Stratton and Rudland, Queen st, Wolverhampton
- Curtis, Caroline, Northrepps, Norfolk, Grocer. March 22 at 12 at the Offices of the Registrar of the County Court, Redwell st, Norwich. Hansell
- Daniel, Lewis, Newport, Monmouth, Draysalter. March 31 at 12 at the Grand Hotel, Broad st, Bristol. Livords
- Davies, John, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Weaver. March 27 at 11 at offices of Howell, Stephen st, Llanelly
- Davis, George Louis, Bristol. March 27 at 3 at offices of Thick Corn st, Bristol
- Devison, William James, and John Devison, Pye Bridge, Derby, Millers. March 23 at 12 at offices of Richards, Weekday Cross, Nottingham
- Deero, Edward, Tonwynlais, Glamorgan, Tailor. March 24 at 12 at offices of Morris, High st, Cardiff
- Dickinson, William Charles, Barrow-in-Furness, Ironmonger. March 28 at 10 at the Victoria Hotel, Church st, Barrow-in-Furness. Bradshaw and Pearson, Barrow-in-Furness
- Dixon, Charles Edward, and Alfred Dixon, Liverpool, Merchants. April 3 at 3 at offices of Banner and Sons, North Joan st, Liverpool. Tyrer and Co, Liverpool
- Eales, Edwin, Manchester, Billiard Table Maker. March 29 at 3 at offices of Harkinson, St James's square, Manchester
- Eccles, Cecil Henry, Liverpool, Cotton Broker. March 27 at 2 at offices of Gibson and Bolland, South Joan st, Liverpool. Wright and Co, Liverpool
- Edwards, George, St Alban's, Hertford, Miller. March 30 at 2.30 at the George Hotel, St Alban's. Annesley, Verulam
- Ellis, Benjamin, Jan, Southold, Grocer. March 29 at 2 at offices of Bardenie and Co, Norfolk st, Shildon
- Emery, John, Salford, Lancashire, Boot Dealer. March 27 at 3 at offices of Edwards and Blithif, Chesapeake, Manchester
- Evans, George, Fintona st, Salford, Saddler. March 30 at 3 at the Fox Hotel, Sowermarket. Goldring
- Farrar, John Aleck, Shunlin, Isle of Wight, Fish Dealer. March 23 at 3 at the Madeira Hotel, Shanklin. Urry and Son, Ventnor
- Field, Charles, High st, Notting hill, Chasesomanger. March 21 at 3 at offices of Wells, Paternoster row
- Fleming, Thomas James Willis, Bath, Somerset, Esq. March 30 at 2 at offices of Reep and Co, Bath lane, Cannon st
- Ford, William, Gloucester, Innkeeper. March 28 at 3 at the Grayhound Hotel, Exeter st, Gloucester. Haines, Gloucester
- Forster, Anthony, Llanwale-in-Tyrys, Grocer. March 31 at 12 at the George Inn, Pilgrim st, Newcastle-on-Tyne. Roberts
- Freeman, James, Westmin, Hants, Builder. March 22 at 3 at offices of Killy, Portland st, Southampton
- Gilbert, Thomas, Cheswilde, Pilow Lane, Manufacturer. March 31 at 12 at offices of Leabury and Co, Chapulte, Carter, Aston friars
- Gilhoon, James Birkies, and Adam Green, Sunderland, Drapers, Tailors. March 24 at 2 at offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sandfield
- Gleeson, John, Wicksworth, Derby, General Dealer. April 3 at 3 at the Sale Room, Commercial chambers, Wardwick, Derby. Hixall, Derby
- Goode, George, Leominster, Hereford, Ironmonger. March 27 at 2 at offices of Andrews, Corn square, Leominster
- Goodman, Lewis, Leeds, Furniture Broker. March 27 at 2 at offices of Crowther, Oxford pace, Leeds. Watson, York
- Gough, John, Tredgar, Monmouth, Grocer. March 27 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Newport. Harris, Tredgar
- Griffith, Robert, Bryn-y-draig, Cae-rhydy, Farmer. March 29 at 2 at offices of Breece and Co, Penian st, Pwllheli
- Hall, James Warren, Blackfriars rd, Coal merchant. March 29 at 12 at offices of Hewlett, Essex st, Harnes
- Hall, John, Southampton, Oxford, Miller. March 31 at 11 at the Fox Inn, Outpining Norton. Killev and Co, Channon Norton
- Hennan, William Henry, Cliftonville, Margate, Kent, Saddlemaster. March 27 at 3 at offices of Sunkay and Co, Cecil square, Margate
- Helem, John, Dewsbury, York, Fish Dealer. March 24 at 10 at offices of Wooler, Exchange buildings, Batley
- Hill, John, Stafford, Mechanical Engineer. March 23 at 3 at the Swan Hotel, Stafford. Morgan, Stafford
- Hind, James, Leicester terrace, Lancaster gate, Builder. April 6 at 2 at offices of Wood, Fish at hill
- Hinton, Benjamin, Wolverhampton, Stafford, Wheelwright. April 3 at 11 at offices of Gills, Queen st, Wolverhampton
- Hiscocks, Alfred M, Lonsdale rd, New Wandsworth, Surveyor. March 27 at 3 at the United Hall Tavern, Gresham st. Haynes, Ironmonger lane
- Holden, Sth, Wolverhampton, Safford, no occupation. March 24 at 12 at offices of Deans and Loochard, Market place, Loughborough
- Hughes, Hugh, Brynmynon, Denbigh, Farmer. March 29 at 2 at the Erskine Arms Hotel, Conway. Jones, Conway
- Isaac, Augustus, William, West Hartlepool, Durham, Hairdresser. March 22 at 3 at offices of Hodgson, Waterloo st, Birmingham, in lieu of the place originally named
- Jalton, Lloy, Rhyd-y-Sorser, Schoolmaster. March 31 at 3 at the Market Hall, Keddill, Greece
- James, Robert Squire, and Robert Farrar, Newton Heath, nr Manchester, Ironfounders. March 23 at 3 at offices of Cooper and Sons, King st, Manchester
- Jenkins, Evan, and William Howells, Swansea, Glamorgan, Blacksmiths. March 25 at 3 at 57, Wind st, Swansea. Woodward

Jones, Alfred Samuel, Middlesbrough, York, Commission Agent. March 24 at 3 at offices of Hallam, Exchange place, Middlesbrough.
 Kellaway, Edwin John, Cross at, Islington, Plumber. March 27 at 11 at offices of Preston, Mark lane.
 Keys, William, Malden, Essex, Iron Merchant. April 6 at 1 at offices of D'gray, Lincoln's inn fields. Diaper and Co, London.
 King, Robert, Birmingham, Eating House Keeper. March 27 at 3 at offices of Parr, Cornmore row, Birmingham.
 Knight, John, Nottingham, Cabinet Maker. March 23 at 12 at offices of Brindle, St Peter's gate, Nottingham.
 Lamb, Samuel, Castley, York, out of business. March 27 at 3 at offices of Hardwick, Infirmary st, Leeds.
 Leeson, John, Ponsford, and Robert Cramp, Margats, Ken's, Brewers. March 22 at 3.30 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st, Sankey and Co, Canterbury.
 Levy, Moss, Brushfield st, Spitalfields, Glass Dealer. March 29 at 3 at offices of Emdin and Robinson, Coleman st. Christmas, Walbrook.
 Malle, George, Huntingdon, Builder. March 2 at 11 at the George Hotel, Huntingdon. Markets, Huntingdon.
 Mathews, Samuel, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, Tailor. April 4 at 12 at offices of Blake, Hall Quay chambers, Great Yarmouth. Hurmer, Great Yarmouth.
 Medahey, William John, Newport, Isle of Wight, Boot Dealer. March 30 at 1 at the Star Hotel, Lower St James's st, Newport. Hooper, Newport.
 Mellor, Thomas Randolph, East India avenue, Leadenhall st, Civil Engineer. March 24 at 12 at offices of Sykes, St Swithin's lane.
 Middleton, George, Leeds, Gas Yard Labourer. March 28 at 2 at offices of Malcolm, Park row, Leeds.
 Mines, Charles, Monks Coppelhall, Cheshire, Publican. April 3 at 1 at the Royal Hotel, Crewe, Brooke.
 Mitchell, William Frederick, Manchester, Estate Agent. April 5 at 4 at offices of Best, Lower King st, Manchester.
 Moore, Humphrey, Leamington, Warwick, Innkeeper. March 27 at 12 at offices of Wright and Hassall, Dorrer place, Leamington.
 Moore, James, Old Brentford, Middlesex, Ironmonger. March 28 at 12 at offices of Hale and Co, Chesham.
 Town, John, Alburgh, Norfolk, Farmer. April 4 at 3 at offices of Meschen, Walk, Beccles.
 Morgan, William, Brumant Farm, Glamorgan, Farmer. March 21 at 11 at offices of Morgan, High st, Cardiff.
 Morgan, William James, Friar st, Journalist. March 29 at 11 at offices of Crane, Paisgrave place, Temple.
 Newman, Samuel, Liverpool, out of business. March 27 at 3 at offices of Last, Lime st, Liverpool.
 Page, Emma, Birmingham, Tailor. March 27 at 3 at offices of Johnson, Waterloo st, Birmingham.
 Partridge, John, Irthingborough, Northampton, Boot Manufacturer. March 24 at 12 at offices of Burnham and Henry, High st, Wellington.
 Pearce, Robert Henry, Dudley, Worcester, Fruiterer. March 24 at 11 at offices of Lowe, Wolverhampton st, Dudley.
 Pegg, James, New cross rd, Deptford, Painter. March 20 at 2 at offices of Perry, Guildhall chambers, Basinghall st.
 Phillips, Edward Caleb, Manchester, Sewing Machine Manufacturer. March 27 at 2 at offices of Farrington, Moyley st, Manchester.
 Pike, George Henry Brumham, Devizes, Wilts, Draper. March 27 at 11 at offices of Randall, Exchange place, Devizes. Day, Devizes.
 Pitman, Thomas, Brynmawr, Brecon, Grocer. March 29 at 3 at offices of Shepa, d, Beaufort st, Brynmawr.
 Porter, John Jameson, Leicester, Draper. April 3 at 12 at offices of James, Millstone lane, Leicester.
 Pratt, George, Aylesbury, Buckingham, Coal Merchant. April 1 at 11 at offices of Miller and Miller, Sherborne lane.
 Proffit, James, Birmingham, Grocer. March 29 at 3 at offices of King, Temple st, Birmingham.
 Rayner, Samuel Smith, Pudsey, York, Waste Dealer. March 24 at 11 at offices of Terry and Robinson, Market st, Bradford.
 Rice, Joseph, Tewkesbury, Gloucester, Corn Dealer. March 28 at 10 at offices of Mours and Romney, Tewkesbury.
 Richardson, Henry, Gateshead, Durham, Grocer. March 27 at 11 at offices of Hopper, Granger st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
 Robbins, Uriah Fellows, Dudley, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. March 28 at 3 at offices of Stokes, Priory st, Dudley.
 Roberts, John, Pontardulais, Glamorgan, Grocer. March 23 at 11 at 7, Rutland st, Swansea. Davies and Harland.
 Russell, Jacob, Cheshyn Hay, Wrexham, Victualler. March 24 at 3 at offices of Sheldon, High st, Wrexham.
 Sankey, Jeremiah, Peckless st, City rd, Timber Dealer. March 27 at 2 at offices of Hutson, Clifton st, Finsbury.
 Sheard, Samuel, Ravensthorpe, York, Olillery Proprietor. March 29 at 3 at offices of Lowdon and Co, Market st, Dewsbury. Quadwick and Sons.
 Shorrocks, James, Blackburn, Lancashire, Cabinet Maker. March 24 at 11 at offices of Darley, Lord st west, Blackburn.
 Shuethwood, Jesse, Dartmouth, Devon, Stationer. March 27 at 12 at the Castle Hotel, Dartmouth. Watts, Newton Abbot.
 Stephens, Thomas Hall, Cardiff, Glamorgan, Fishmonger. March 30 at 3 at the Black Swan Hotel, Widemarsh st, Hereford. Morgan, Cardiff.
 Strutt, William, Chelmsworth, Suffolk, Farmer. March 30 at 12 at the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Handleigh. Newman and Harper, Handleigh.
 Stubby, John, Ruddington, Nottingham, Provision Dealer. March 24 at 11 at offices of Stafford, Lincoln st, Nottingham.
 Thompson, John, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancashire, Boot Maker. March 24 at 11 at Sharp's Temperance Hotel, Strand, Barrow-in-Furness.
 Thompson, Barrow-in-Furness.
 Varley, Thomas, Little Hurton, Bradford, York, Boot Maker. March 27 at 11 at offices of Barnley, Queensgate, Bradford.
 Virley, William Henry, West Wratting, Cambridge, General Shop Keeper. March 30 at 1 at the Lion Hotel, Cambridge. Ellison and Barrow, Cambridge.
 Wade, James Edwin, Torquay, Devon, Hairdresser. March 29 at 12 at offices of Carter and Son, Cary buildings, Abbeys, Torquay.
 Walker, Charles, Aston nr Birmingham, out of business. March 27 at 3 at offices of Perry, Bennet's hill, Birmingham.
 Walton, James, Loffhouse gate, nr Wakefield, York, Publican. March 24 at 3 at offices of Lake, Southgate, Wakefield.

Waterworth, George, Bury, Lancashire, Grocer. March 29 at the offices of Grundy and Co, Union st, Bury.
 White, William Henry, Hulme, Lancashire, "Druggist's Sunbryman." April 3 at 4 at offices of Best, Lower King st, Manchester.
 Whitehouse, John, Water Orton, Warwick, Commission Agent. March 24 at 2 at offices of Southall and Co, Newhall st, Birmingham.
 Wicks, Samuel, Ashford common, S. Essex, Bricklayer. March 30 at 2 at offices of Howse, Staple inn, Holborn. Morris, Staple inn, Holborn.
 Wilkerson, Edward, Higher Boughton, Lancashire, Coach Builder. March 30 at 3 at offices of Hiron and Grundy, Cross st, Manchester.
 Wilson, Thomas William, Holborn Viaduct-archway, Farringdon st, Grocer. April 3 at 2 1/2, Caesopside. Williams, Salters' Hall court, Cannon st.

Now ready,

HEYWOOD'S PRACTICE of the COUNTY COURTS.

Second Edition, 1 vol., royal 12 mo, price 21s., cloth,

THE JURISDICTION and PRACTICE of the COUNTY COURTS, comprising the whole Practice, except in Admiralty and Bankruptcy. The sections of the Judicature Act applying to County Courts, and the whole of the County Court Statutes, and the Rules, Orders, Forms, and Scales of Fees and Costs are printed in the Appendices. Second Edition, entirely re-written and greatly enlarged. By GEORGE WASHINGTON HEYWOOD, of the Middle Temple, Barrister-at-Law.
 London: W. MAXWELL & SON, 29, Fleet-street.

This day, Fourth Edition, in one thick vol., royal 8vo, 45s., cloth,

THE LAW of SLANDER and LIBEL (founded upon Starkie's Treatise), including the Pleading and Evidence, Civil and Criminal, adapted to the present procedure; also, Malicious Prosecutions, and Contempts of Court. By H. C. FOLKARD, Barrister-at-Law.
 London: BUTTERWORTES, 7, Fleet-street.

Just published, 12mo, pp. 600, clo h, 10s. 6d. (postage 6d.).

THE COUNTY COURT STATUTES, 1846 to 1875, with the Consolidated Orders, Forms, Fees, and Costs. Practical Notes, and very full Index. By G. MANLEY WETHERFIELD, Solicitor, Author of "Mayor's Court Procedure," "Liquidations and Compositions," &c.
 London: CHANCERY LOCKWOOD & CO., 7, Stationers' Hall-court, E.C.

Just published, price 1s.,

AYCKBOURN'S DIGEST of PRACTICE CASES under the Judicature Acts, containing every important Decision in the various Reports up to the 5th February 1875.
 London: WILBY & SON, Lincoln's-inn-archway.

Just published, price 2s. 6d., cloth, by post for 30 stamps,

THE AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS ACT (1875), 38 & 39 Vict., cap. 93; with Introduction, Notes, and Index. By GEORGE SELLS, M.A., of St. John's College, Cambridge, and of Lincoln's-inn and the Midland Circuit, Barrister-at-Law.
 London: DAVIS & SON, 37, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn, W.C.

EDE AND SON.

ROBE MAKERS.

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' and REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' and QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS &c

ESTABLISHED 1649.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

YATES & ALEXANDER,

PRINTERS, LITHOGRAPHERS, STATIONERS,

ETC.

CHANCERY-BUILDINGS, 23, CHANCERY-LANE,

LONDON.

Every description of Printing.

Judicature Affidavits
 Appeals
 Parliamentary Minutes
 Books
 Pamphlets
 Reports
 Rules

Catalogues
 Prospectuses
 Magazines
 Newspapers
 Circulars
 Posters
 Handbills, &c., &c.

CARR'S, 265, STRAND.—Dinnars (from the joint) vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d., or with Soup or Fish, 2s. and 3s. 6d. "If I desire a substantial dinner of the joint, with the agreeable accompaniment of light wine, both cheap and good, I know only of one house, and that is in the Strand, close to Danes Inn. There you may wash down the roast beef of old England with excellent Burgundy, at two shillings a bottle, or you may be supplied with half a bottle for a shilling."—All the Year Round, June 18, 1864, page 400.

The new Hall lately added is one of the handsomest dining-rooms in London. Dinners (from the joint) vegetables, &c., 1s. 6d.

EQUITY AND LAW LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,

18, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1844.

CAPITAL, ONE MILLION, FULLY SUBSCRIBED.

TRUSTEES.

The RIGHT HON. VISCOUNT CARDWELL.
The RIGHT HON. SIR WILLIAM ERLE.
The HON. THE VICE-CHANCELLOR SIR RICHARD MALINS.

THOS. GLOVER KENSIT, Esq.
JOHN M. CLABON, Esq.
ROBERT JOHN PORCHER BROUGHTON, Esq.

SUMS ASSURED, £4,265,000. TOTAL INCOME, £193,506.

ASSETS, £1,153,455.

EXPENSES OF MANAGEMENT, £7,106.

The RESERVE retained by the Society in respect of its liabilities under Policies has been calculated according to the HIGHEST STANDARD.

The realized PROFITS are ascertained every Five Years; and NINE-TENTHS of the whole are divided among the Assured. As considerably more than One-Tenth of the Profits is derived from Policies which do not participate in the Profits, it will be seen that *the Assured have greater advantages in this Society than if they formed a Mutual Insurance Company*, dividing among themselves the whole of the Profits derived from their own Policies.

At an Extraordinary General Meeting, held on June 9, 1875, the sum of £844,397 was set aside as the value of the Society's liabilities under its Assurance and Annuity Contracts, and £173,180 was ordered to be divided as Bonus; leaving a balance of undivided Profit of £20,033.

Nine-tenths of the sum divided was allotted among holders of Policies for £2,500,000.

TABLE of TOTAL ADDITIONS made up to December 31, 1874, to POLICIES of £1,000 each.

Ages at Entry.	NUMBER OF PREMIUMS PAID.					
	Thirty.	Twenty-five.	Twenty.	Fifteen.	Ten.	Five.
30	£685 10 0	£549 0 0	£434 10 0	£290 10 0	£175 0 0	£78 10 0
45	841 0 0	678 10 0	530 0 0	353 10 0	211 0 0	93 0 0
60			787 10 0	517 0 0	310 10 0	137 10 0

LAPSES.—One calendar month is allowed for payment of premiums; but if through an oversight the payment of premium should be omitted the Policy will be revived within three months after the lapse on payment of a fine at the rate of One Shilling per cent. on the sum assured for each month or part of a month which may have elapsed.

G. W. BERRIDGE, ACTUARY AND SECRETARY.